

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
VOLUME LXVIII

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
VOLUME LXVIII

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES BY

N. GONIS D. OBBINK

and

P. J. PARSONS

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

H. AMIRAV	C. F. L. AUSTIN	L. CAPPONI
D. COLOMO	B. CURRIE	K. DOULAMIS
E. W. HANDLEY	A. KERKHECKER	H. MAEHLER
F. MALTOMINI	R. NÜNLIST	J. RADICKE
M. v. ROSSUM	M. SALEMENOU	C. SCHULER
	A. WOUTERS	

Graeco-Roman Memoirs, No. 88

PUBLISHED FOR
THE BRITISH ACADEMY
BY THE
EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG
2003

TYPESET BY THE STINGRAY OFFICE, MANCHESTER
PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY THE CHARLESWORTH GROUP, HUDDERSFIELD
AND PUBLISHED FOR
THE BRITISH ACADEMY
BY THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
(REGISTERED CHARITY NO. 212384)
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG

Graeco-Roman Memoirs

ISSN 0306-9222

ISBN 0 85698 142 7

© EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY 2003

PREFACE

Section I of this volume contains new texts of Greek drama: **4639** offers a tragic *rhesis*, probably by Euripides, **4640** plot-summaries of two tragedies (both items may have some connection with the lost *Hippolytos Kalyptomenos*); **4641–6** continue our publication of comedy, **4641** a useful addition to Act II of Menander's *Epileptontes*, **4642** and **4643** perhaps assignable to *Kitharistes* and *Hymnis*; in unassigned fragments we hear of a patriot and shouting (**4645**) and of a formal betrothal (**4646**). The section continues with unknown prose texts: a rhetorical exercise, *Enkomion of the Horse* (**4647**), and a learned treatise on star-signs as evidenced in Greek poets (**4648**); **4649–51** also quote Hesiod, while **4652** contains a glossary to the Hesiodic *Scutum*.

The Hesiodic reference continues in Section II. **4653–66** include all the remaining papyri of *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, and *Shield* thus far identified in the holdings of the Egypt Exploration Society; their textual interest lies above all in their omission or inclusion of verses suspected by ancient scholars and modern editors. We have added two rarities (**4667–8**): a fragment with *Homeric Hymns* 18 and 7 (consecutively), and the first known papyrus of *Batrachomyomachia*.

Section III contains three writing exercises and the like, chosen for their palaeographic interest (**4669–71**); and three pieces of erotic magic (**4672–4**).

The documentary texts in Section IV come mostly from the fifth century AD (a period from which we have relatively few papyri). They have been chosen primarily for their chronological and prosopographical interest. Many provide the earliest or latest known dates for the use in Egypt of certain consulates for dating purposes; this and any other relevant information has been made available to Professors Bagnall and Worp for the new edition of their *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*. Others attest Oxyrhynchite magnates with titles of nobility and so offer glimpses of the provincial élite of the Later Roman Empire. **4703–4** provide rare examples of Oxyrhynchite documents from the period of Persian rule in Egypt. At the same time the texts illustrate the continuing flow of essential business: loans, supplies of wine, leases of land and houses and individual rooms, the maintenance of irrigation machines (**4697**) and the transport down river of the grain owed to the state (**4685**).

Dr Gonis and Dr Obbink prepared the indexes for the literary and subliterate texts (**4641–2** were indexed by Dr R. Nünlist); Ms L. Capponi and Dr Gonis indexed the documentary texts. The plates have been produced from digital images created by Dr R. Hatzilambrou and Mr P. Micklem.

We record our gratitude to all the contributors; to Dr Jeffrey Dean for the deftness and precision with which he formatted the text; and to Messrs Charlesworth for their dispatch in the printing and binding. Dr Rea and Professor Thomas read and commented on large parts of the volume in draft; Dr Coles worked through the texts of Comedy and Magic, greatly to their benefit. The British Academy has readopted The Oxyrhynchus Papyri as one of its Major Research Projects; but we have a great additional debt to the Arts and Humanities Research Board for the generous grant which has made it possible to continue the whole enterprise.

The signatures below reflect a reconstitution of the editorial board. In future the Advisory Editors will contribute by reading and commenting on the material at an early stage; the General Editors will carry through the final revision and the process of production.

October 2003

R. A. COLES	N. GONIS
J. R. REA	D. OBBINK
J. D. THOMAS	P. J. PARSONS
<i>Advisory Editors</i>	<i>General editors</i>

CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
TABLE OF PAPYRI	ix
LIST OF PLATES	xi
NUMBERS AND PLATES	xi
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND ABBREVIATIONS	xiii

TEXTS

I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS (4639–4652)	1
II. KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS (4653–4668)	73
III. SUBLITERARY TEXTS (4669–4674)	107
IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS (4675–4704)	124

INDEXES

I. TRAGEDY AND COMEDY	169
II. PROSE	172
III. SUBLITERARY TEXTS	173
IV. RULERS	175
V. CONSULS	176
VI. INDICATIONS AND ERAS	176
VII. MONTHS	177
VIII. DATES	177
IX. PERSONAL NAMES	177
X. GEOGRAPHICAL	179
XI. RELIGION	180
XII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS AND TITLES	180
XIII. PROFESSIONS, TRADES AND OCCUPATIONS	181
XIV. MEASURES	181
XV. GENERAL INDEX OF WORDS	181
XVI. CORRECTIONS TO PUBLISHED TEXTS	184

TABLE OF PAPYRI

I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

a. TRAGEDY AND COMEDY

4639	Tragedy (Euripides?)	AK	First/second century	1
4640	Hypotheses to a <i>Theseus</i> and <i>Hippolytus</i> ?	MvR	First/second century	7
4641	Menander, <i>Epitrepontes</i>	RN	Second/third century	22
4642	Menander, <i>Kūtharistes</i> ?	RN	First/second century	28
4643	Menander, <i>Hymnis</i> ?	CFLA/PJP	First/second century	33
4644	Comedy (or Satyr Play?)	CFLA/PJP	First/second century	35
4645	New Comedy	EWB	First/second century	37
4646	New Comedy	EWB	Second century	43

b. PROSE

4647	Encomium of the Horse	HM	Second/third century	47
4648	Prose on Star-Signs Quoting Homer, Hesiod, and Others	DO	Third century	52
4649	Prose Quoting Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 6–7 (or 8?)	DO	Third century	64
4650	Prose Quoting Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 218–19(?)	DO	Second century	65
4651	Prose Quoting Hesiod, <i>Opera et Dies</i> 219–23	DO	Third century	68
4652	Glossary to Hesiod, <i>Scutum</i> 243, 245, 308, etc.	DO	Fifth century	69

II. KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

4653–66	Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> , <i>Opera et dies</i> , <i>Scutum</i>	DO		73
4653	Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 143(?)–9, 411–20	MS	Third century	75
4654	Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 334–9	BC	Third century	78
4655	Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 549–58, 562(?)–7	LC	First century	79
4656	Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 667–84, 707–20(?), etc.	DO	Second century	81
4657	Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 820–31, 859–65	PJP	Second century	84
4658	Hesiod, <i>Theogonia</i> 913–17	DO	Third century	86
4659	Hesiod, <i>Opera et Dies</i> 8, 17–27	DO	Second century	87
4660	Hesiod, <i>Opera et Dies</i> 57–63(?), 91–106	DO	First century BC/ first century AD	91
4661	Hesiod, <i>Opera et Dies</i> 563–7	KD	Third century	93
4662	Hesiod, <i>Opera et Dies</i> 771(?)–6	DO	Second century	94
4663	Hesiod, <i>Opera et Dies</i> end title	DO	Second century	95
4664	Hesiod, <i>Scutum</i> 92–106	CS/JR	First/second century	97
4665	Hesiod, <i>Scutum</i> 220–30	DO	Second/third century	99
4666	Hesiod, <i>Scutum</i> 253–65, missing 259	DO	Second/third century	100
4667	<i>Hymni Homerici</i> xviii 4–11, vii 1–11	NG	Third century	102
4668	[Homer,] <i>Batrachomyomachia</i> 41, 53–8	AW	Second/third century	104

TABLE OF PAPYRI

III. SUBLITERARY TEXTS

a. SCRIBAL PRACTICE AND DRAFT

4669	Writing exercise	PJP	First/second century?	107
4670	Notice	PJP	Fourth century	108
4671	Tabula Ansata	PJP	Fifth century?	110

b. MAGIC

4672	Erotic Magical Formulary	DC	Third/fourth century	111
4673	Erotic Magical Spell	HA	Fourth/fifth century	114
4674	Erotic Magical Spell	FM	Fourth/fifth century	117

IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

4675	Order to Pay	NG	397/8?	124
4676	Order to Supply?	NG	6 September 404	125
4677	Lease of Land	NG	26 September 408	125
4678	Top of Document	NG	18 October 409	127
4679	Foot of Document with Consular Date	NG	21 December 418	127
4680	Order to Supply Oil	NG	11 February 419	128
4681	Lease of an Upper Room	NG	10(?) August 419	129
4682	Lease of Land (?)	NG	9(?) October 421	132
4683	Order to Supply Wine	NG	1 December 426	134
4684	Petition (?) to a <i>Riparius</i>	NG	431	134
4685	Lists of Ships and Freights	NG	Fifth Century	135
4686	Top of a Lease	NG	5 September 440	139
4687	Lease of Land	NG	26 May 441	141
4688	Deed of Surety	NG	1 May–24 June 442?	143
4689	Lease of Part of a House	NG	29 August 442	146
4690	Acknowledgement of Debt	NG	10 September 442	147
4691	Top of Document	NG	16 April 453	148
4692	Top of a Lease	NG	31 July 453	149
4693	Lease of a Room	NG	27(?) February 466	150
4694	Lease of a House	NG	14 December 466	152
4695	Top of Document	NG	31 August 472	153
4696	Top of Contract	NG	2 September 484	154
4697	Receipt for Parts of Irrigation Machine	NG	27–31 December 489	156
4698	Top of Contract	NG	3 October 490	160
4699	Order to Supply Wine	NG	23 January 504	160
4700	Top of Contract	NG	18 November 504	161
4701	Top of Document	NG	505?	163
4702	Acknowledgement of Loan	NG	5 February 520	164
4703	Deed of Surety	NG	22 May 622	166
4704	Receipt for Payment to <i>Potamitae</i>	NG	29 Aug.–27 Sept. 626	167

III. *SUBLITERARY TEXTS*

xi

HA= H. Amirav
 DC = D. Colomo
 NG = N. Gonis
 HM = H. Maehler
 DO = D. Obbink
 MvR = M. van Rossum

CFLA = C. F. L. Austin
 BC = B. Currie
 EWH = E. W. Handley
 FM = F. Maltomini
 PJP = P. J. Parsons
 MS = M. Salemenou
 AW = A. Wouters

LC = L. Capponi
 KD = K. Doulamis
 AK = A. Kerkhecker
 RN = R. Nünlist
 JR = J. Radicke
 CS = C. Schuler

LIST OF PLATES

I. 4639	IX. 4669, 4670
II. 4652, 4640	X. 4671, 4672
III. 4652, 4641, 4643	XI. 4673
IV. 4649, 4642, 4644, 4653	XII. 4674
V. 4645, 4647	XIII. 4685
VI. 4667, 4651, 4648	XIV. 4687
VII. 4646, 4650, 4659	XV. 4688
VIII. 4704, 4666	XVI. 4677, 4703

NUMBERS AND PLATES

4639 I	4645 V	4651 VI	4669 IX	4677 XVI
4640 II	4646 VII	4652 II, III	4670 IX	4685 XIII
4641 III	4647 V	4653 IV	4671 X	4687 XIV
4642 IV	4648 VI	4659 VII	4672 X	4688 XV
4643 III	4649 IV	4666 VIII	4673 XI	4703 XVI
4644 IV	4650 VII	4667 VI	4674 XII	4704 VIII

NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND ABBREVIATIONS

The basis of the method is the Leiden system of punctuation, see *CE* 7 (1932) 262–9. It may be summarized as follows:

$a\beta\gamma$	The letters are doubtful, either because of damage or because they are otherwise difficult to read
...	Approximately three letters remain unread by the editor
[$a\beta\gamma$]	The letters are lost, but restored from a parallel or by conjecture
[...]	Approximately three letters are lost
()	Round brackets indicate the resolution of an abbreviation or a symbol, e.g. ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta$) represents the symbol $\overline{\alpha}$, $\epsilon\tau\rho(\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma)$ represents the abbreviation $\epsilon\tau\rho\varsigma$
[[$a\beta\gamma$]]	The letters are deleted in the papyrus
$\tilde{a}\beta\overset{\sim}{\gamma}$	The letters are added above the line
$\langle a\beta\gamma \rangle$	The letters are added by the editor
$\{a\beta\gamma\}$	The letters are regarded as mistaken and rejected by the editor

Bold arabic numerals refer to papyri printed in the volumes of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*.

The abbreviations used are in the main identical with those in J. F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca* (*BASP* Suppl. no. 9, ⁵2001); for a more up-to-date version of the *Checklist*, see <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>.

I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

a. TRAGEDY AND COMEDY

4639. TRAGEDY (EURIPIDES?)

73/9(a)

fr. 1 9.5 × 19 cm

First/second century
Plate I

Four pieces in the same hand, possibly from the same roll. The writing runs parallel with the fibres. The backs are blank; *κόλλησις* in fr. 2. The sequence of the fragments cannot be established. They are here numbered according to size.

Fr. 1 preserves parts of two successive columns: (i) Foot of a column, line endings (6 or 7 lines; the blank space below line 2 allows for one or two shorter lines). (ii) Line beginnings (20 lines) and full height of a column, with an upper margin of 2.5 cm, and a lower margin of 4 cm. Beginnings of trimeters. Towards the foot, the column slightly slopes to the left. Fr. 2: upper part of a column, 12 lines and an upper margin of max. 2 cm. This is the middle section of some trimeters (or tetrameters?), the area around the caesura. At the start of each line, the first metrum is lost. Line 6 is blank. It may have contained an *exclamatio extra metrum*, now broken off. Fr. 3: remains of 4 lines. Fr. 4: traces of one line (two letters).

The fragments are written in the large and handsome rounded capital usually called 'Roman Uncial'. This is an elegant specimen, though not as accomplished as I 20, LXIV 4410, 4411, P. Ryl. III 514, the Hawara Homer (*GMAW*² 13) — or even P. Tebt. II 265. The closest parallels are XXIII 2354, XXXII 2624, XLV 3229, LIX 3972, and esp. LXII 4301. Cf. also VIII 1084, XI 1362, XX 2260, XXX 2511, XXXII 2634, XXXVII 2801, 2805, 2807, XLV 3214, XLIX 3447, LIX 3963, 3964. Somewhat less formal (and perhaps earlier?): V 844, VIII 1090, XV 1806, XXIII 2378, XXVII 2468, XXXII 2623, XXXVII 2818, XLI 2944, XLVII 3325, P. Ryl. I 60, III 482.

This style is highly formal and calligraphic. There are no ligatures. Letters are strictly bilinear, except ϕ (ψ is not attested here). With the exception of ι , they would all fit into a square that is more or less equal for every letter.

α and λ are very similar: the cross-bar of α is high up. Descending obliques of α , λ , λ begin from above the apex. ϵ , θ , \omicron , ς are carefully rounded. μ is deep and rounded with a bowl-shaped centre. The loop of ϕ is a broad, well-rounded oval. The letters are richly decorated. There are serifs and finials at the end of almost every stroke, including the top oblique of κ and the caps of ϵ , ς (but no blob on the cross-bar of ϵ). There is also a clear, though not extreme, tendency to 'shading': verticals and descending obliques are thick, horizontals and rising obliques are fine.

There are numerous lectional signs. Accents: fr. 1 i 5, ii 1, 2, 10, 14, 19; fr. 2.1, 3, 8, 10; fr. 3.1? Breathings (Turner's form 1): fr. 1 ii 2, 5, 8, 14, possibly fr. 2.2. Accents and

breathings are usually written exactly above the letter, or over the middle of a diphthong (fr. 1 i 5, ii 14; fr. 2.1, 10). Sometimes they are moved slightly to the right: fr. 1 ii 5, 8 (br.), and fr. 2.3, 8 (acc.).

Diaeresis (inorganic): fr. 1 ii 2; fr. 2.12. Apostrophe (to the right above the letter, not between letters): fr. 1 ii 1, 8, 14. Punctuation ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta$): fr. 1 i 1, 7, ii 6; fr. 2.8, 9. *Scriptio plena*: fr. 1 ii 2 (but not fr. 1 ii 1, 3, 8, 14; fr. 2.7). ι *adscriptum* is nowhere required (but see fr. 1 ii 20 n.).

Iotacism: probably fr. 2.5. Correction: fr. 1 ii 3 — no cancellation, just written above (see n.). The correction seems to have been made by the scribe himself: κ and α are a little thinner and less formal (presumably because they are written smaller), but the ink appears to be the same. Diaereses and $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$ must have been written with the text: they are well-spaced, thick blobs. The other signs are thinner: the spacing suggests that they were added later; the ink suggests that this was done by the same hand.

This was a roll carefully written in an ambitious style. It was extensively marked, punctuated, and corrected by the scribe himself. The layout was generous, with ample margins. A beautiful copy — perhaps a luxury edition of a classic? What was its content?

Fr. 1 contains the beginnings of trimeters, fr. 2 the middle of a column of trimeters (or tetrameters?). No certain instances of resolution; *correptio Attica* in fr. 1 ii 2, but apparently not in fr. 1 ii 7. Metre and language suggest tragedy. If so, the most likely candidate (at this time) is Euripides. The diction supports this (see comm., esp. fr. 1 ii 8 n.). I find nothing to contradict it. If Euripides, which play?

Fr. 1 preserves part of a $\rho\acute{\eta}\gamma\iota\varsigma$. The speaker seems to remain the same throughout, but it does not emerge who s/he is. When the text begins, s/he addresses a group (fr. 1 ii 1f.), presumably the chorus, about someone else. S/he then addresses this person: first indirectly (fr. 1 ii 3–7; note the 3rd pers. sg. imperatives), then directly (from fr. 1 ii 8; taken up in 12? 14, 15? 16?).

The speaker complains of $\upsilon\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ (fr. 1 ii 2). The tone is angry and dismissive (note the series of asyndetic imperatives). The opponent is sent away (fr. 1 ii 4f., and probably 8) on horseback (1.6). Is he (fr. 1 ii 1 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$?) the speaker's son (fr. 1 ii 19 e.g. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda[\eta\mu\alpha]$?; cf. fr. 1 ii 20), banished from the speaker's house (fr. 1 ii 19 e.g. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda[\alpha\theta\rho\nu]$?)? Is he absent or present during the speech? Has he just left, or is he on the point of leaving, perhaps after an $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$? And what is the relevance of the agricultural references in fr. 1 ii 7f.?

The beginning of the speech is lost: $\acute{\epsilon}\hat{\alpha}\tau\epsilon \delta' \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ (? fr. 1 ii 1; see n.) can hardly have been its opening words. Its conclusion *may* survive in fr. 2.1–5. Fr. 2.3 $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ would suit the end of the speech (cf. the first-person references at fr. 1 ii 14, 16, 17, 19). Fr. 2.9 is blank: probably because it contained an *exclamatio extra metrum* (presumably the reaction of a new speaker). When the text resumes, the speaker has changed: 2.8 $\text{[}\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ strongly suggests the chorus. In their first line (2.7), they address the previous speaker as their lord and master: $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\omicron\tau(\alpha)$. If the speaker of fr. 1 is the same as in fr. 2.1–5, it follows that he is male (2.3, 7), and a figure of authority.

If taken together like this, fr. 1 and 2 (can be made to) cohere closely — enough, in fact, to yield the outline of a scene: the end of a $\rho\acute{\eta}\gamma\iota\varsigma$, and the reaction of the chorus. This

	αλλῆρπ'εσα.[ἀλλ' ἔρπ' ἐς ἀγ[
	φιλωσκαταρ[φίλωσ καταρ[
10	χωτανπαρη[χώταν παρη[
	νικανεπιστ[νικάν ἐπιστ[α
	ηταυταβουλ[η ταυταβουλ[
	καιμηδενα[καὶ μηδενα[
	ἀγ'εἶαμοικ[ἄγ' εἶά μοικ[
15	εχθρωνκα[ἐχθρων κα[
	ηκαιδοκωσ[η καὶ δοκῶ σ[
	επισταμαι[ἐπίσταμαι [
	ειγαρπαθει.[εἰ γὰρ παθει.[
	.ουμόνμελ[τοῦμόν μελ[
20	ωσρουτεπαιδ[ὡς οὔτεπαιδ[
	foot	

Fr. 2

	top	
]τόιησανω.[]τοίησανωσ[
]ν. κρεσσονω.[]ν ὦν κρε<ι>σσονω.[
]εμαντονεξεπί[] ἔμαντόν ἐξεπί[σταμαι
]ντακαικαθημε[]ντα καὶ καθημε[
5] . τρειβονταμη.[] . τρίβοντα μη.[
] [
]νωνδεσποτεξ[]νων δέσποτ' ἐξ[
]ώμεθα· μ.[.]εστ[
] . ν· μηδ.[...]· γ.[
10]υνη.[...]· [...]· [...]· [
]ντη[
] . ὑμε[
	· · ·	

Fr. 3

· · ·
] . ρώ[
] αν[

Fr. 4

· · ·
] λ . [

]τ αυ[
]. ε ν δ ο[

Fr. 1

col. i 1 after θ, rising oblique or arc with trace of horizontal (?) in mid-line (ε?) 2],, foot of a descending oblique, or serif 3], back of a circular letter without cross-bar: ο, ω 7 foot of a descending oblique and μέεη

col. ii 2], traces of left-hand arc of a circular letter: ε, ο, ω 3 κ above λ, but λ not cancelled 5 dot below α (accidental?) 6], upright with horizontal joining at the top and projecting to the right: left-hand part of π rather than τ 7 ρ], too far closed for ω, and one can see where the right-hand arc joins the left 8], upright with horizontal joining at the top and projecting to the right: left-hand part of τ or π 18], slightly sloping vertical with serif at the foot 19],, trace high up in the line, probably the tip of a horizontal

Fr. 2

1], back of a circular letter without cross-bar: ο or c (probably not ω); if φ, part of the upright should be visible 2]ν.,, first perhaps ω, with ink high up in the line; second perhaps η (foot of left, top of right vertical and traces of the right-hand angular join) 3], trace in mid-line and on bottom, with serif at the foot 4 η, the verticals only 5],, top of an upright: η, ι, η 8 dot above the right-hand tip of the first μ (accidental?) after the second μ, the top of an upright 9]ν, right-hand arc of a closed circular letter without cross-bar: ο or ω δ], back of a circular letter with cross-bar: ε or θ], γ, tip of a rising oblique: γ; of κ and χ, one might expect to see the lower oblique, too γ], back of a circular letter without cross-bar: ο or c (probably not ω) 10 χ], a rising oblique: λ, λ some traces high up in the line 12],, traces (partly on lower layer) of an open circular letter with cross-bar: ε?

Fr. 3

1],, horizontal trace at bottom line level trace to the left above ω too thick for an accent? too far to the left? 4],, traces in mid and on bottom line

Fr. 4

1 back of a circular letter with cross-bar: ε or θ

(The following commentary is greatly indebted to the edition of Richard Kannicht (in his forthcoming *TrGF* 5), and to a first draft by PJP.)

Fr. 1

col. i

1]θ ε[ι]c. Kannicht.

2]αι κακ] Kannicht.

col. ii

1 ἐάτε: either 'let alone' (frequently with impersonal object, but also personal) or 'permit' (with infinitive, as *E. Med.* 313f τήνδε δὲ χθόνα | ἐάτε μ' οἰκεῖν, *Tr.* 466f ἐάτε μ(ε) . . . κείσθαι περσοῦσαν, *S. Tr.* 815 ἐάτ' ἀφέρπειν (αὐτήν scil.), *Ph.* 1055 ἐάτε μίμνεω (αὐτόν scil.), all beginning a trimeter). ὑβρίζει[ω (2) favours the latter, and establishes the combative tone of the imperatives (parallel construction supported by anaphora).

δ' shows that this is not the beginning of the speech; inceptive δέ is restricted to prose (Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 172 (iii)).

αὐτο[: αὐτό[ν would provide a subject for the infinitive suggested by 2 (e.g. *ἔατε δ' αὐτό[ν πόλλ' ὀνειδίξειν ἔμῃ*), who could be identified with the subject of the third-person imperatives in 4 and 6. But of course contexts could be imagined for αὐτό, αὐτο[ύς, αὐτο[ίς.

2 *ἔαθ' ὑβρίζε[ω*: on asyndeton with anaphora, see Kühner–Gerth, *Grammatik* II 345 c.

3 *μήτ' εἰ* seems certain, although the scribe did not mark the elision. *μήτε* here may imply a balancing *μήτε* (γάρα) in 2 (Kannicht); it cannot be a sentence-connective, adding a third imperative to *ἔατε . . . ἔατε* or introducing *ὀρίζετω*.

καλ^κ[: on confusion of opposites, see Kannicht on E. *Hel.* 264–6; *fr.* 378.2; 554a.4; 682.3.

4 *ὀρίζετω*, not *ὀρίζε, ὀρίζετ'* etc., as 6 shows (there the articulation is guaranteed by punctuation). This may well be the beginning of a new sentence, see n. on *fr.* I ii 3. If so, there is asyndeton: probably because *ὀρίζετω* continues (with a change of person) the series of imperatives, and restates or interprets the preceding commands.

ἵππεύετω suggests that *ὀρίζετω* expresses motion (then *πρ[ός* Kannicht). Possible senses include (a) 'traverse' (following the boundary between two points) and (b) 'separate from' (draw a boundary between): 'incertum utrum [a] *Med.* 432–5 *ἔπλευσας . . . διδύμους ὀρίσασα . . . πέτρας* (ubi *Σ Β ἀντὶ τοῦ διαστείλασα καὶ διεξελθοῦσα τὰς Κυμπληγάδας*) ~ A. *Suppl.* 540–6 (Kerkhecker) an [B] *Hel.* 128 *χειμῶν ἄλλος' ἄλλον (πορθμῶν scil.) ὤρισε* (~ *ibid.* 1670) vel *Hecl.* 940–1 *ναῦς . . . μ' ἀπὸ γὰς ὤρισε* *Ἰλιάδος conferendum* (Kannicht). But (c) moral 'definition' (*Hecl.* 801 *ζῶμεν ἄδικα καὶ δίκαι' ὠριζόμενοι*) may not be excluded (PJP).

5 *ὄπο[: ὄπο[ν* (E. *Heracl.* 19, 46 PJP)? *ὄπο[ιον* Kannicht.

7 '[A.] *Prom.* 708 *ἀνηρότους γνάς, Moschion.* 97 F 6,9 *ἀρότ' ροῖς . . . ἔτέμευτο | . . . βῶλος* (Kannicht).

8 'locutus Euripidis propria: *Andr.* 433 = *Hecl.* 1019 = F 86 col. II 4 [150,1 Austin] = F 773,10 [*Phaëth.* 54 Diggle] *ἄλλ' ἔρπ' ἐς οἴκουσ ~ Cycl.* 345 *ἄλλ' ἔρπετ' εἴως ~ Andr.* 1263 *ἄλλ' ἔρπε Δελφῶν ἐς . . . πόλιν, Tro.* 92 *ἄλλ' ἔρπ' Ὀλυμπον, Hel.* 477 *ἄλλ' ἔρπ' ἀπ' οἴκων* (brevius *IT* 699 = 1411 = S. *Trach.* 616 *ἄλλ' ἔρπε ~ S. Trach.* 819 *ἄλλ' ἔρπέτω ~ OC* 1643 *ἄλλ' ἔρπεθ'*); de S. F 109 *fr.* 10,4 ~ *adesp.* F 632,35 *ἄλλ' ἐρ.* [non liquet' (Kannicht). E. *Med.* 403 *ἔρπ' ἐς τὸ δεινόν* (PJP).

ἄχ[ροῦς Kannicht. This would suit the rustic detail of 7, though *ἄχ[ρας* (E. *Ion* 1161, *Suppl.* 885) could also be thought of (PJP). Hunting on horseback, mentioned in passing at X. *Cyn.* II.3, might suit Hippolytus.

9 *φίλωσ* (imit. *trim Hipp.* 597 *φίλωσ καλῶσ δ' οὐ*) pot. qu. *φίλ' ὤσ* (Kannicht).

καταρ[χὴν, καταρχου, κατάρ[ξας, κατ' ἀρ[χάς etc. (PJP).

10 E. *Alc.* 356 *παρή* (PJP). *παρή[ις* δέ sim., *παρή[τε* (Antiphon. *fr.* 94.2 K.–A. *fin. trim ὅταν παρής*) (Kannicht).

11 *νικᾶν ἐπιστ[α : ἐπίστ[ας* (E. *Ion* 650 *παύσαι λόγων τῶνδ', εὐτυχεῖν δ' ἐπίστασο*; PJP)? *Alc.* 61 x — *ἐπίστασαι* δέ, *Hipp.* 380 x — *ἐπιστάμεσθα*, *ibid.* 919 x — *ἐπίστασθ'* (Kannicht).

12 *βούλ[ει? 'ἦ ταῦτα vel ἦ ταῦτὰ βούλ[ηι? Cf. Phoen.* 386 *ἄ γὰρ σὺ βούλη, ταῦτ' ἐμοὶ . . . φίλα, IT* 614 *ἐπεὶ δὲ βούλη ταῦτα* (Kannicht). But *ταῦτ' ἀβουλ[* is also possible (S. *El.* 546 *οὐ ταῦτ' ἀβούλου καὶ κακοῦ γνώμην πατρός*; PJP).

13 *μηδένα, μηδέν' α[, μηδὲν α[, μηδ' ἐν α[?*

14 The scribe writes *ἀγ'εῖα* to clarify the articulation around the exclamation (not *ἄγεια*, not *εῖα*). The aspiration of *εῖα* recurs in other papyri of drama (S. *Euryph.* *fr.* 221.4; 222b *fr.* 7.4; *Ichn.* 314.93, 174, 436 R.; *Trag. adesp.* 655.40 K.–S.; Epich. *fr.* 113.177 K.–A.), and is implied in the etymology stated at Schol. A *Il.* 9.262a (Herodian? hence Hdn. I 495 Lentz), which derives *εῖα* from *εἰ, τοῦ τόνου ἀλλαγέντος εἰς περισπώμενον ἀναγκαίως καὶ τῆς δασειᾶς Ἀττικῶς προσελθοῦσης*. Kannicht on E. *fr.* 693,1; Diggle on E. *Phaëth.* 221. Cf. Kannicht on E. *Hel.* 1429–33 and 1560–4, and Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1650.

ἀγ'εῖα μοι κ[seems the most likely articulation; but if we cannot rely on the scribe to mark elisions, *μ' οἴ κ[* or *μ' οἰκ[* come into consideration.

15 *ἐχθρῶν κά[κιστε? ἔχθρ' ὄν?*

16 *ἦ or ἦ? c[οι?*

18 'παθεῖν [(Ba. 492 εἴφ' ὅτι παθεῖν δεῖ), πάθει π[sim.?' (Kannicht). E. *Hyps. fr.* 60 i 41 B. α[εχρ]ὸν γὰρ εὖ μὲν ἐξέπιστασθαι παθεῖν (RJP).

19 'μέλ[αθρον (= Ba. 1309) Kerkhecker; μέλ[ει σοι sim.?' (Kannicht). μέλ[ημα?

20 οὔτε παιδ[: most obviously, οὔτε παιδ[. But since the scribe does not always mark elision (note fr. 1 ii 3 μῆγε), οὔτ' ἐπαιδ[ῆ, ἐπάδ[ων or the like may not be excluded. ('neither by enchantment nor by . . . will you change my decision'; cf. A. *Ag.* 69–71, where Fraenkel suggested *exempli gratia*: οὔθ' ὑποκαίων οὔτ' ἐπιλείβων | οὔτ' ἐπαοιδαῖς ἀπύρων ἱερῶν | ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει.)

Fr. 2

1 Kannicht suggests e.g. ἀπιε]τοίης, ὕλακ]τοίης, αἰ]τοίης, ζῆ]τοίης, νοε]τοίης ἄν. ἐπ]τοίησαν is not found in tragedy.

2 κρε(ι)εσόνων Kannicht; 'cf. Dionys. trag. 76 F 6 κρεῖσσον codd.: KPECCON PSI IX 1093,52–3 (cf. Thraette *Gr. Att. Inscr.* 2,309) . . . Ion. Ch. 19 F 38,3 x – v ἄλλων κρεῖσόνων' (Kannicht).

3 ἐξέπι]σταμαι Kannicht; he compares *Trag. adesp.* 327.1 K.–S. ἐγὼ δ' ἐμαντοῦ καὶ κλύειν ἐπίσταμαι | . . .

4 καθ' ἡμέ[ραν, καθήμε[νον?

5 Not ἐ]κτρι-.

6 'extra metrum e.g. εἶέν· vel φεύ·' (Kannicht).

7 'δέεποτ' hac sede vs. *Hel.* 1627' (Kannicht).

A. KERKHECKER

2640. HYPOTHESES TO A THESEUS AND HIPPOLYTUS?

100/1(a)

14.5 × 16.4 cm

First/early second century
Plate II

Two columns of stories about Theseus and Hippolytus written along the fibres of a papyrus roll that in the second column overlaps with and augments the text preserved in P. Mich. inv. 6222A (M. Van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests* no. 7). The roll was broken or torn vertically at the line-beginnings of col. ii, but was repaired (with slight text loss) in antiquity. The back is blank except for a patch attached in order to repair the break and strengthen the roll. (For testimonia and examples of repair of papyrus rolls by means of glued papyrus patches in antiquity see E. Puglia, *La cura del libro nel mondo antico: Guasti e restauri del rotolo di papiro* (Naples 1997) chaps. 2–3 pp. 29–79.) Running the full height of the fragment, the patch shows a section c.3 cm wide from the end of a column of fragmentary accounts in a documentary script written along the fibres and oriented in the same direction as the writing on the front. The hand of the documentary text is of a type usually assigned to the second/third century AD, making it possible that the text on the front could have been in use for as much as a century or more.

The script belongs to the plain round style represented by Roberts, *GLH* 9c (late first century BC), 10c (AD 66) and 14 first hand (earlier second century?). It is bilinear in effect (λ, β, Δ, λ project above and β, ρ, γ, φ sometimes project below the line). The nose of λ (looped at left in the manner of hands of the first century BC – first century AD) plunges

steeply below the line. The rounded letters are circular, becoming closely written and vertically compressed toward ends of lines in order to leave an even right-hand margin: some line-ends show more oval forms and tiny omicrons. α at beginning of words is frequently enlarged, with a well-developed loop connecting the left down-strokes and the cross-strokes. The right-hand oblique of α and λ projects above the apex. Mid-stroke of ϵ extends beyond the opening; sometimes it makes contact with the inside of the bowl and sometimes stands clear of the left-hand arc. θ : the mid-stroke never significantly exceeds the sides. η has a high cross-bar, while the right side of π is markedly curved. There is a variety of delicately placed decorative curls, hooks, blobs, half-serifs and a few full serifs. No clear shading.

There are no lectional signs, but some small spaces are found between words: cf. i 3 before $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$, i 12 before $\tau\acute{o}\nu$, i 14 before and after $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ and ii 12 before $\alpha\pi$]. Col. i 3, 4 and 14 have small line-fillers and above the heading in i 19 are some decorative strokes. A correction has been made supralinearly in i 1 and a cancellation in ii 8 is marked by dots above the letters. It is not possible to distinguish the hand of the corrections from that of the text. Iota adscript occurs in i 4, but is not used in i 3 and 16, and there are some itacistic writings ($\epsilon\epsilon$ instead of ι). Elision is employed without indication in i 1, ii 8 and 13. In the first two cases, it has caused a problem in copying.

The columns had at least 21 lines (inferred from the fact that there must have been several lines of the following hypothesis in col. i before ii 1). The lines in col. i extended to at least 42 letters and probably contained more. Those of col. ii contained $\epsilon.55$ –70 letters if the text here closely replicated that of P. Mich. 6222A, and if that text has been correctly restored by its editor at $\epsilon.32$ letters per line (see on col. ii). The surviving upper margin of 4 cm shows the column number 38 ($\lambda\eta$) above the first column. We can deduce from this that the part of the roll preceding this column must have been around 7.5 metres, assuming a column width of $\epsilon.20$ cm (18 cm as reconstructed + 2 cm intercolumnar space \times 37).

The text does not exhibit the type of headings usually found in the Euripidean hypotheses (see on i 19), while P. Mich. inv. 6222A preserves no headings. It could be one of three types: (i) Euripidean hypotheses; (ii) mixed hypotheses; (iii) mythographical prose stories.

(i) Euripidean hypotheses. The two stories strongly resemble the Euripidean hypotheses in style and wording and they are more extensive than those on the same characters in the other mythographical accounts. Second, we know that Euripides wrote plays on Theseus (cf. below) and Hippolytus. The title at i 19 (apparently a heading introducing a story that continues in col. ii, rather than an end-title of the text in col. i) could be restored as Ἰππόλυτος (or, more likely, Ἰππόλυτος πρῶτος) $E[\upsilon\rho\iota\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma]$ (see note). If correct, this would imply that the preceding story summarized a play by some other dramatist, making it unlikely that both hypotheses concerned Euripidean plays. This might point to:

(ii) mixed hypotheses. The first story could be a hypothesis of Sophocles' *Theseus* (cf. below) followed by a hypothesis of Euripides' *Hippolytus*. An argument against this option is the fact that we do not have other examples of such mixed collections, while there are many papyri with Euripidean hypotheses, e.g. XXVII **2455**, **2457**, LII **3650–3652**, LX **4017** and PSI XII 1286 (for additional examples see LII **3653** introd. p. 30; collected by

Van Rossum-Steenbeek (*Greek Readers' Digests* nos. 1–16); LII **3653** (no. 17 Van Rossum-Steenbeek) gives two Sophoclean hypotheses in the same style.

(iii) We cannot exclude the possibility that we are dealing not with hypotheses but with unspecified mythographical prose stories ordered alphabetically or thematically. These stories may be related in one way or another to the tragedies and/or hypotheses.

As regards the first story, two plays concerned with the story of Theseus and Ariadne come into consideration: Sophocles' or Euripides' *Theseus* (the plays attested for Achaeus and Hera[], *TrGF* I 20 F 18 and 37, are not likely to appear in the papyri). Sophocles' *Minos* (F 407) does not seem to have dealt with our episode.

(a) Sophocles' *Theseus*. Apart from the single quotation (F 246) there is XXVII **2452** (*TrGF* 4 F 730 a–g). These fragments have been ascribed to Sophocles for linguistic reasons, whereas T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967) 106 favours Euripidean authorship. We learn from these fragments that Ariadne pities the young Athenians (because they are the tribute to the Minotaur; cf. 730 c.15) and Eriboea asks for pity (730 a–b); Theseus asserts that someone, presumably the Minotaur, will be caught (730 c), and he leaves (730 d); a celestial phenomenon is described (730 e) and at 730 f mention is made of someone's wishes. These data are not incompatible with our text, although the latter does not seem to mention Eriboea, a celestial phenomenon or wishes. The names of Minos, Daedalus and Athena, on the other hand, are absent in fr. 730 a–g.

(b) Euripides' *Theseus*. We know that Euripides wrote a play called *Theseus*; cf. Eur. fr. 381–90 N²; Mette, *Lustrum* 23–4 (1981–2) 130–34 = fr. 493–513 and cf. L **3530** (= F 386 b in Kannicht, *TrGF* 5, forthcoming). The fragments do not give much information: the scene must be Crete and the play deals with Theseus, Minos, the Minotaur and the tribute. Wilamowitz's ideas about Theseus and his three wishes, by which the *Aegeus*, *Theseus* and *Hipp.* I would have been connected, are not supported by the fragments; cf. Webster, 105–6. Eur. fr. 1001 N², a fragment about the thread, may also belong to this play. Fr. 388 N² is concerned with pious love. We do not know the speaker of these words nor the addressee, but this fragment suggests, as Webster, 107, argues, that Theseus is warned or warns himself not to abandon Athens for the love of Ariadne. Webster refers to Erika Simon who offered the idea that this fragment comes from a final speech by Athena. It is tempting to connect this idea with our text (see commentary on i 16), but we must remember that our story may have nothing to do with Euripides' play.

On **2452** see above. **3530** is not very helpful: it is probably part of a messenger-speech and may belong either to Euripides' *Aegeus* or to his *Theseus*: 'The messenger describes his vantage-point (2–3), then the beast (5–9), then Theseus (10 ff.) stripped for action'.

For the story of Theseus and Ariadne in general, see F. Brommer, *Theseus: die Taten des griechischen Helden in der antiken Kunst und Literatur* (Darmstadt 1982); *LIMC* III Addenda and VII (s.v. Ariadne and Theseus); C. Calame, *Thésée et l'imaginaire Athénien* (Lausanne 1990) 78–116; S. Mills, *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1997).

Until 14 the text seems to tell the familiar story: Theseus kills the Minotaur with the

help of Ariadne and Daedalus; Ariadne wants to be taken to Athens. From this point (14) onwards, it is unclear what happens; cf. commentary.

Several summaries (referred to in the notes) tell the myth of Theseus and Hippolytus in wording arguably similar to the papyrus: e.g. Apollod. *Epit.* 1.8–9:

ὡς δὲ ἦκεν εἰς Κρήτην (cf. i 1), Ἀριάδνη θυγάτηρ Μίνωος ἐρωτικῶς διατεθεῖσα πρὸς αὐτὸν κυμπάσσειν (so S: περάσειν E) ἐπαγγέλλεται, ἔαν ὁμολογήσῃ γυναικα αὐτὴν ἔξειν ἀπαγαγὼν εἰς Ἀθήνας. ὁμολογήσαντος δὲ σὺν ὄρκοις Θεσεῦος δεῖται Δαιδάλου μνησῆσαι τοῦ λαβυρίνθου τὴν ἔξοδον (cf. i 3–4). ὑποθεμένου δὲ ἐκείνου, λίνον εἰσιόντι Θεσεῖ δίδωσι· τοῦτο ἐξάψας Θεσεὺς τῆς θύρας ἐφελκόμενος εἰσῆμι. καταλαβὼν δὲ Μινώταυρον ἐν ἐσχάτῳ μέρει τοῦ λαβυρίνθου παίων πυγμαῖς ἀπέκτεινεν, ἐφελκόμενος δὲ τὸ λίνον πάλιν ἐξῆμι. καὶ διὰ νυκτὸς μετὰ Ἀριάδνης καὶ τῶν παίδων εἰς Νάξον ἀφικνεῖται. ἔνθα Διώνυσος ἐραθεὶς Ἀριάδνης ἤρπασε, καὶ κομίσας εἰς Λήμνον ἐμίγη.

A less full version is given by D.S. 4. 61.4:

καταπλευσάντων δ' αὐτῶν εἰς Κρήτην Ἀριάδνη μὲν ἢ θυγάτηρ τοῦ Μίνωος ἠράσθη τοῦ Θεσεῦος εὐπρεπείαι διαφέροντος, Θεσεὺς δ' εἰς λόγους ἐλθὼν αὐτῇ καὶ ταύτην συνεργὸν λαβῶν, τὸν τε Μινώταυρον ἀπέκτεινε καὶ τὴν ἔξοδον τὴν τοῦ λαβυρίνθου παρ' αὐτῆς μαθὼν διεσώθη· cf. Plu. *Thes.* 19.1 ἐπεὶ δὲ κατέπλευσεν εἰς Κρήτην . . . παρὰ τῆς Ἀριάδνης ἐραθεύσας τὸ λίνον λαβῶν, καὶ διδαχθεὶς ὡς ἔστι τοῦ λαβυρίνθου τοὺς ἐλιγμοὺς διεξελθεῖν, ἀπέκτεινεν τὸν Μινώταυρον καὶ ἀπέπλευσε τὴν Ἀριάδνην ἀναλαβὼν καὶ τοὺς ἠιθέους.

See further sch. *Il.* 18.590, sch. *Od.* 11.322, sch. AR 3.997 and Hyg. *Fab.* 42 *Theseus apud Minotaurum* and 43 *Ariadne*.

As regards the second story in the papyrus, comparable prose stories about Hippolytus and Phaedra are found in: the hypothesis of *Hipp.* II transmitted both in medieval manuscripts and in P. Mil. Vogl. II 44 (this papyrus text is rather fragmentary but seems to be similar to the medieval hypothesis); Apollod. *Epit.* 1.18–19; D.S. 4. 62.2–4; Plu. *Parallela minora* 314A–B; Hyg. *Fab.* 47; sch. *Od.* 11.321; Tzetz. Lyc. 1329. See W. S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) 1–45, for the history of the legend including a discussion of the lost *Hipp.* I and fr. 428–47 N². See also *LIMC* v, s.v. Hippolytus.

An advance towards reconstruction of col. ii is gained through an overlap with P. Mich. inv. 6222A (ed. pr. G. W. Schwendner, *Literary and Non-Literary Papyri from the University of Michigan Collection* (diss., Univ. of Michigan 1988) 24–9; re-edited by W. Luppe, ‘Die Hypothesis zum ersten “Hippolytos”’, *ZPE* 102 (1994) 23–39 with Taf. 1A, and subsequently by Van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests* no. 7 (pp. 15 descr., 195–6 text), who notes the overlap (pp. 16, 22), and again by Luppe, ‘Nochmals zur Hypothesis des ersten “Hippolytos”’, *ZPE* 143 (2003) 23–6). Written in a version of the ‘Severe Style’ dating from the end of the second or beginning of the third century, P. Mich. 6222A (hereafter P. Mich.) appears to contain a text of a story about Hippolytus. In his re-edition Luppe assumes that we are dealing

with a hypothesis to the lost *Hipp. I*. The wording of the present papyrus does not seem to be incompatible with the Euripidean *Hipp. II*, although it shows no overlap with the medieval hypothesis to this play. On the other hand, it has several phrases in sequence in common with P. Mich., and this text has several details that seem to be incompatible with *Hipp. II*: (i) *Θετταλι*[a fr. A7, (ii) *Ἰπ*]πολύτου *στολήν* fr. B3 and *κα*]λυψάμενον fr. B5. (i) It has been plausibly conjectured (Barrett, op. cit. 32, Luppe) that in the first play Theseus was absent in Thessaly, helping Pirithous. (ii) In view of the title of the first play — (*Κατα*)*Καλυπτόμενος* (cf. Pollux 9, 50; sch. Theoc. 2, 10) — it seems most natural to interpret *στολήν* and *]λυψάμενον* as clothing and (un)veiling oneself (see on line 14 in further notes on P. Mich. 6222A below). Even if we could explain *]λυψάμενον* otherwise (e.g. *ἀποκα*]λυψάμενον — cf. LSJ s.v. *ἀποκαλύπτω* ‘reveal one’s whole mind’) — *στολήν* remains problematic.

Thus P. Mich. does seem to be concerned with the content of *Hipp. I*; and the same can be assumed for the corresponding section of **4640**, which overlaps it. From the overlap of the two texts it is possible to determine the line lengths of each, but only within rough limits (see on col. ii). The arrangement of the principal P. Mich. fragments A–C and thus the reconstruction of the play provided by Luppe do not agree with our new text, which shows that Luppe’s fr. C should precede fr. B. See below on col. ii for a reconstruction combining **4640** with P. Mich.

The text and notes have benefited from a draft of the edition by R. Kannicht for *TrGF* 5 (forthcoming) and comments supplied by Professor Diggle. Citation of other dramatic hypotheses on papyri in the notes is by the name of the play and the relevant papyrus, with line numeration according to the ed. pr. For hypotheses transmitted in medieval manuscripts, reference is to the text and line numeration of the edition of J. Diggle, *Euripides* I–III (Oxford 1981–94) unless otherwise mentioned. The restorations of the line beginnings in col. i are merely plausible ones, suggested *exempli gratia*, and commensurate with wording of the story elsewhere.

Col. i

	(m.2) λη
(m.1)]νυπομειναςεπειδ[[η]]είστηνκρητην
]ρεγενεθηπαιδωνεισαχθειςειστον
]νωταυροναπεκτειεν καιραδι>
]νδαιδαλουβοθησαντοςαυτωι>
5]καθηναιοςκαιτηςτουβασιλεως
]θησειναγωνιωσηςπροσεσεβη
]υχθειςδιακονειουκαπωκνησεν
]ωλειαναισθομενοςτουμεινωταυ
]ωτουςπεριθησεατονκινδυνον
10]ωστηκαριαδνηςεπιθυμιασπη

]ομμενπατεραπρωτονε .ειεντον
]ξιωσαι τονδεθηρεαπαρεστησατο
]ντοσαποπλεινεαυτηναλαβον
]αθηνας ευπλοησεν α[.]ιαδνην>
 15]εγημεμεινωδεθυμμε
]κελευσασαγαμωτηνοργηνημεσο
]τηννεωτερανθυγατερηαπ[. . .]
]
]τοϛ ξ[]~[
 20] . [

Col. ii

τωνκατεςφαξ[
 χαραξασαπαρ . . [.
 ιππολυτουδ . [.
 μεταβιαστο . [.
 5 παρθενων . . . [.
 πλειονογει . [.
 πιστευσασα[
 καιμε[[τα]]τουπ[
 τοναεβησα[
 10 λειπομεν[
 πονεκελ[
 .οβον απ[
 .ιδαποτυχ[
 λευσειντου[
 15 θ[.]σαιλημ[
 λευχωνων[
 εξητειπ . [.
 . . τρος . [.

col. i 2], end of oblique, probably α 5], right curve of ο or ω 11], right part of lower curve as of ο, ω ε, traces of left and right parts of a horizontal at top with top of right upright descending and foot of upright at left as of π, not c 13], dot in mid-line and at bottom, apparently ε 15 θυμ is followed by upper left curve of round letter; gap; high horizontal stroke and curve (either π or right part of τ, c, τ plus the left side of round letter); horizontal at top and a smaller one at bottom; gap; low dot, some traces in

the middle and end of horizontal in upper part of line 17], [, slightly curved horizontal stroke, low in the line 20], [, dot
 col. ii 2 . [, upright, followed by curved letter (ε, θ, ο, c), perhaps with cross stroke (ε, θ) 3 . [, vertical
 4 . [, several dots, perhaps η? 5 . . [, two round letters (the first ο or θ; the second ε, θ, ο,
 or c) and a high dot 6 . [, traces at top of line, probably η 12 . ο, trace at lower right as of λ, λ,
 x 13 . ι, three small strokes (slightly more likely of π than of τ) have been displaced 17 ε, or θ π.
 small oblique below line, λ? 18 high horizontal and high small oblique, πλ? (before these strokes in margin
 a thick horizontal that does not seem to be part of the text) . [, high horizontal

Col. i

(m.2) λη

(m.1)]ν ὑπομείνας· ἐπεὶ δ' [[η]] εἰς τὴν Κρήτην
]. ρεγενεθη παίδων εἰσαχθεὶς εἰς τὸν
 λαβύρινθον --- τὸν Με]ινώταυρον ἀπέκτεινεν καὶ ῥαδί-
 ως --- τὴν ἔξοδον εἶδρε]ν Δαιδάλου βοηθήσαντος αὐτῶι
 5] . c Ἀθηναῖος καὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως
 θυγατρὸς Ἀριάδνης ---] Θεσεὶ συναγωνιώσῃς πρὸς εὐσεβῆ
]υχθεὶς διακονεῖν οὐκ ἀπόκνησεν·
 ὁ δὲ Μείνω --- τὴν ἀπ]ώλειαν αἰσθόμενος τοῦ Μεινωταύ-
 ρου]ω τοὺς περὶ Θεσεά τὸν κίνδυνον
 10]ως τῆς Ἀριάδνης ἐπιθυμίας ὑπη-
 τ]ὸν μὲν πατέρα πρῶτον ε . εἰεν τὸν
 α]ξιῶσαι, τὸν δὲ Θεσεά παρεστήσατο
] . ντος ἀποπλεῖν ἑαυτὴν ἀναλαβόν-
 τα] Ἀθῆνας εὐπλόησεν, Ἀ[ρ]ιάδνην
 15] ἔγημε· Μείνω δεθυμ με
] κελεύσασα γάμω τὴν ὄργην μεσο-
] τὴν νεωτέραν θυγατέρα π[. .]. [
]
] τοῦ ἔ[] ὅ[]
 20] . [

Col. ii

των κατέφαξ[
 χαράξασα παρ . . [
 Ἴππολύτου δ . [
 μετὰ βίας το . [

3–4 On the wording of these lines, see the versions cited above and cf. also D.S. 1.61.2 on a labyrinth: λαβύρινθον . . . ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ δύναται ραϊδίως τὴν ἔξοδον εὔρεῖν; sch. *Il.* 18.590 ὄπω (Theseus) . . . εἰσέλθοι εἰς τὸν λαβύρινθον, καὶ . . . πάλιν ἔχοι ραϊδίαν καὶ εὐέρετον αὐτῶι τὴν ἔξοδον τοῦ λαβυρίνου.

4 τὴν ἔξοδον εἶρε]ν. εἶρεν τὴν ἔξοδο]ν is equally possible. For εἶρεν see LII **3650** *Alex.* 32 ἀνέυρε; hyp. *Hipp.* 17 εἶδρεν.

4–7 In this text, Daedalus seems to play a more important role than in most of the other versions: in D.S., Plu. and Hyg., Daedalus' help is not even mentioned, and in sch. *Il.* and *Od.*, Daedalus helps indirectly, i.e. by giving Ariadne instructions. It is only in Apollodorus that we hear that Ariadne asks Daedalus to assist, after which the latter suggests how Theseus can find his way out of the labyrinth. It has been suggested that Theseus used a wish to escape from the labyrinth, cf. the discussion in Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* 39f. and L **3530** p. 26, but nothing in our text points to this.

5–7 seem to contain an explanation of why Daedalus offered his help to Theseus. His Athenian provenance is well known (cf. Apollod. 3.15.8), and according to Cleidemus *FGHist* 323 F 17 (cited by Plu. *Thes.* 19.9) Daedalus was a cousin of Theseus. A possible supplement of line 5 is e.g. [ἦν γὰρ καὶ ἐκεῖν]ος; Diggle suggests [ἐγένετο γὰρ ἐκεῖν]ος — both somewhat shorter than expected; better for space is [τυγχάνων γὰρ καὶ αὐτ]ός. In Eur. fr. 390 N² he is called *κυμπολίτης*, but η before c cannot be read here.

5 τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως is undoubtedly Ariadne, who must by now have been introduced in the story. For her motive for helping Theseus see 10 ἐπιθυμία.

6 πρὸς εὐσεβῆ; presumably from an Athenian point of view. The issue is hardly whether it was pious (or dutiful or righteous?) to kill the Minotaur. But it would be pious for Daedalus to help Theseus (as an Athenian) and the daughter of his benefactor and employer.

7]υχθείς. Diggle proposes [παρανομίαν εἰσκηρ]υχθείς. Or we might restore [(ἐν) ὄρκωι or ὄρκωις ζε]υχθείς preceded by a noun belonging to εὐσεβῆ; cf. E. *Supp.* 1229 καὶ τόνδ' ἐν ὄρκωις ζεύξομαι. But this hardly exhausts the possibilities. One might consider e.g. [καὶ ὑπ' ἐκείνης ἐντε]υχθείς, since Daedalus 'was himself an Athenian and since Ariadne the king's daughter was assisting Theseus, when appealed to by her too for loyal duty (πρὸς εὐσεβῆ), he did not flinch from giving his services'.

διακονεῖν. Cf. XXVII **2455** *Sciron* 82 διάκονον.

8 In contrast to other versions of the myth that focus on the adventures of Theseus and Ariadne, this text has Minos playing an active role. On the wording of 8, cf. hyp. *Ba.* 14 Κάδμος δὲ τὸ γεγονός κατασθόμενος; PSI XII 1286 *Rh.* i 4–5 ἐπισητημένος.

9 Although τοὺς περὶ Θηρέα can refer both to Theseus alone and to him and his companions (cf. S. L. Radt, 'OI (AI etc.) ΠΕΡΙ + acc. nominis propriae bei Strabon', *ZPE* 71 (1988) 35–40), the second option seems preferable. οἱ περὶ plus proper name occurs in other hypotheses as well; see LII **3650** *Alex.* 23, hyp. *Andr.* 9, *Pirith.* 14 (ed. H. Rabe, *RhM* n.s. 63 (1908) 144), PSI XII 1286 *Rh.* i 8 and *Scyrū* ii 22.

κίνδυνον. Cf. (in different contexts) PSI XII 1286 *Rh.* i 1–2; LII **3650** *Alex.* 31; XXVII **2455** *Phrixus* I 237.

τοὺς περὶ Θηρέα and τὸν κίνδυνον probably belong to one verb with two accusative objects. If τὸν κίνδυνον belongs to another verb or clause (in this case we should put a stop after *Θηρέα*), we would be lacking a conjunction such as δέ. 9 (and 10) perhaps relate that Minos learns that Theseus escaped from the danger: e.g. 9–10 ἐπέγν]ω τοὺς περὶ Θηρέα τὸν κίνδυνον [φεύγοντας . . . ; cf. hyp. *Heracl.* 15, PSI XII 1286 *Scyrū* 13. Diggle proposes *Μειωταύ*[[ρου καὶ φηγόντας οὐτ]ω.

10]ως. Perhaps *Θηρέ*]ως? Diggle suggests *διέβαλε Δαίδαλον*] ὡς τῆς Ἀριάδνης ἐπιθυμίας ὑπη[[ρέτην λαβών· ἢ δέ τ]ὸν κτλ.

ἐπιθυμία: cf. hyp. *Hipp.* 9 εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ὤλισθεν.

11–12 Ariadne is the subject of the two main verbs in lines 11–12 in view of the word *πατέρα* in 11 and *ἐαυτήν* in 13. She is probably mentioned at the beginning of 11: e.g. ἢ or αὐτῆ and then δέ or γάρ. For such phrases as τὸν μὲν πατέρα . . . τὸν δὲ Θηρέα balanced in hypotheses, see J. Diggle, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 3–6 = *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford 1994) 330–4.

11 The traces suggest *επειεν*. This may have been written for *ἐπειθεν* or *ἔπειεν*, the confusion having been induced by similarity of letter-shapes (ε, ϑ, c). The imperfect *ἐπειθεν* would imply that her persuasion fails; the

aorist ἔπεικεν suggests success. ἔπεικεν occurs not infrequently in the hypotheses: **2457** *Aeolus* 27 ἔπεικε τὸν πατέρα . . . *νοικοκύραι*; **3650** *Alex.* 10–11; hyp. *Ba.* 12; **2544** *Ph.* 8; **3652** *Phrixus I* ii, 31. However, this is far from certain; it is not inconceivable (on the same reasoning) that something like ἔσειεν was intended: ‘she began to blackmail her father into granting . . .?’ (for the sense see LSJ s.v. *σειώ* 4).

The other accounts of this myth do not contain any request from Ariadne to her father. Again, Minos seems to have been more important in the version followed in the papyrus than in the existing accounts. ἔπεικεν τὸν and ἀ]ξιῶσαι do not immediately suggest a context for themselves. (κατ)αξιῶ also occurs in **3650** *Alex.* 9 and 24, P. Mich. fr. C 8; hyp. *Alc.* 9. τόν at the end of 11 is likely to precede a noun denoting a man, an event or a thing; e.g. ἄνδρα, ξένον, φόνον, ἔρωτα. In the remainder of the gap in 12 we may suppose a noun in the genitive.

12 α]ξ. κατα]ξ- quite likely? On whose behalf does Ariadne try to persuade her father to take a decision: her own? Theseus’ or Daedalus’? Diggle suggests [βοηθὸν μὴ ζημίαι ἀ]ξιῶσαι. With βοηθὸν compare 4 βοηθήσαντος (referring to a different case).

13]ντος. Ending of a participle? A possible supplement is e.g. Μείνω(ος) | τοῦ πατρὸς (ἐξ)ὀργισθ[--- | οὐ πεισθ]έντος, or perhaps Δαιδάλου with a participle.

14ff. The action of the story seems to have ended (as it began) in Crete. If we are dealing with the hypothesis to a play, the voyage of Theseus and the situation of Ariadne must have been reported in the play. 15–17 must deal with the sequel.

14 Ἀθηναι could be either the goddess (on the spelling Ἀθηνᾶς, cf. PSI XII 1286 *Rh.* i, 6 and XXVII **2455** *Tr.* 163) or the city. The latter seems most natural in view of εὐπλόηεν. A possible supplement is ἀναλαβόν[τα --- | Θησεὺς μὲν οὖν εἰς] Ἀθήνας.

14–15 Ἀ[ρ]ιάδην | [- - -] ἔγημε. Theseus sails away: (i) He is also the subject of ἔγημε and marries Ariadne (not very likely in view of 15–17 and the traditional myth). According to the usual ending of the story, Theseus and Ariadne arrive at Dia/Naxos, where Ariadne is either left behind by Theseus and taken as wife by Dionysus (*Hyg. Fab.* 43; sch. *Od.* 11.322) or she is taken away from Theseus by Dionysus, after which Theseus leaves in distress (*Apollod. Epir.* 1.9; D.S. 4.61.5). *Plu. Thes.* 20 offers some other obscure and rationalistic versions. (ii) If this version follows the traditional story and Theseus is subject of ἔγημε, we could supplement e.g.: [δ’ ἐν Νάξω(ι) λιπὼν οὐκ] ἔγημε (suggested by Diggle). It seems unlikely that someone other than Theseus could be subject of ἔγημε: the reference would have to be exceptionally brief and would leave much unexplained.

15 Μείνω: Genitive, dative, or accusative.

16 κελεύσασα: Preceded by a female subject, perhaps Athena. Plays often end with the appearance of a god, who explains past events, indicates or commands future actions, etc. And these are often reflected in hypotheses of plays: e.g. hyp. *Andr.* 16ff.; hyp. *Hipp.* 21ff.; hyp. *Or.* 18ff.; PSI XII 1286 *Rhad.* ii 30ff. Although appearances of a god are usually described in the hypotheses as ἐπιφανείς, this is not always the case: see e.g. hyp. *Hipp.* 21ff. Ἄρτεμις δὲ τῶν γεγενημένων ἕκαστα διασαφήςασα Θησεὶ . . . For Athena in the present situation, see sch. *Od.* 11.322, where she orders Theseus to leave Ariadne behind and go to Athens (cf. above, introd., on Eur. fr. 388 N²). In this connection one might also think of Minos’ wife Pasiphae, but in her case κελεύσασα might seem strangely authoritative.

γάμω: Either the previous union between Theseus and Ariadne or a future marriage between Theseus and Minos’ younger daughter (see on 17).

τὴν ὀργήν: Someone is angry. Theseus when he has been robbed of his bride? Or Minos for a variety of reasons may be angry with Theseus. In most versions, Minos does not seem to agree with Ariadne’s engagement to Theseus, whereas AR 3.1000–1 has ἀλλ’ ἡ μὲν καὶ νηός, ἐπεὶ χόλον εὐνάσε Μίνωσ, σὺν τῷ ἐφεξομένη πάτρην λίπε. Cf. R. L. Hunter’s note on 997–1004: ‘Jason’s words in 1000 and 1100 hint at a version in which Minos formally gave Ariadne to Theseus . . . it is probable that A. had (?Cretan) sources for such a version’, comparing *FGrHist* 328 F 17a with Jacoby’s comments p. 1106–7n.; H. Herter, *RhM* 91 (1942) 228–37. For ὀργήν in conjunction with a technical observation on the psychology of dramatic characters in hypotheses, cf. XXVII **2455** *Ph.* 303–4 [τὴν ὀργήν]ν λοιπογρα[φή]σας (cf. hyp. *Ph.* 20 and crit. app.).

μεσο-. Perhaps a form of μεκολαβέω, i.e. to interrupt or cut short Theseus’ (or the god’s?) anger (part of an infinitive after κελεύσασα or part of another participle?). Cf. D.S. 16. 1. 2 αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἡμιτελεῖς πράξεις οὐκ ἔχουσαι

]εcθαι μ]ετανο-].να.α[
15	. . .
fr. Ba	. . .
]δε.[
	. . .
fr. Bb	. . .
]. [].οcκ[]ψcπλ[]ηη[
	. . .
fr. D	. . .
].α.[].εν.[]αιτου[
	. . .

The regular overlapping and non-overlapping lines show the line-lengths of **4640** to have been much longer than those of P. Mich. Hence in about every other line in P. Mich. there is a series of letters preserved that are duplicated in **4640**. The lines of P. Mich. are reconstructed at a length of c.32 letters by Luppe (though, of course, they may have been shorter). On this reconstruction (assuming an identical text), the lines of **4640** will have been 55–70 letters in length. The series of overlapping letters shows that we are dealing with the same text of a story about Hippolytus. However, caution must be exercised, since the text cannot be assumed to be everywhere identical: in at least one place the two diverge: **4640** ii 16 has ε]λεγχον ων[, while P. Mich. fr. B 8 reads ε]λεγχον γενομε[. Thus we may have to deal with two differently transmitted versions of the same story about Hippolytus with similar phrasing in some parts and different phrasing elsewhere.

A composite text showing the approximate correspondence of the papyrus with P. Mich. appears below. This is given without lectional signs and only such restorations as may be regarded as beyond reasonable doubt. The lineation has been adapted to that of the present papyrus, with spacing based roughly on Luppe's reconstruction of P. Mich. at c.32 letters per line. **4640** supplies the line-beginnings (printed in plain text), while P. Mich. (underlined) provides the right hand portion of the column. Letters that occur in both texts

polytus has his chariot accident; something is done with Hippolytus' cloak. In 14 ff. Theseus and Phaedra are presumably confronted with the truth, although Phaedra may try to hide it. But much remains obscure: what is Hippolytus' role? Is he dead or alive? Does a servant play an active part? When does Phaedra kill herself?

1 κατέφαξ[. Probably κατέφαξ[ε(ν) or -αν. For (κατα)εφάτω cf. XXVII 2455 *Ph.* 293 and hyp. *Ph.* 14; hyp. *Hec.* 15 and *Tr.* 8.

2 χαράξασα: sc. Phaedra. P. Mich. here gives]ενχαρ[. This may be one word, e.g. ἐγχαράσσω, 'to engrave upon' (compl. dat.) or the end of a word in -εν and the beginning of χαράξασα. So Plu. *Parall. min.* 314B, where Phaedra ἐπιστολάς ἐχάραξε καὶ βρόχῳ τὸ ζῆν ἀνήρτησε. That this is the reference here gets some support from 4 μετὰ βίας. Phaedra traditionally inscribes her accusation on a writing tablet: cf. *Hipp.* 865 δέλτος; Hyg. *Fab.* 47 *tabellas*, and cf. ii ι (in the composite text above) where P. Mich. may be restored as either κα]λάμοις or θα]λάμοις (Luppe).

παρ is almost certain: typically rounded right side of π, followed by apex of λ connecting to middle of upright of ρ with underside of bowl preserved; τουν excluded. After that we have two diagonals connecting so high in the line that only λ, λ, λ are compatible. After that we have an upright followed by a round letter, perhaps with cross-bar: παραιθ[?

4 μετὰ βίας is probably part of Phaedra's accusation that Hippolytus raped her; cf. *Hipp.* 885 εὐνής . . . ἔτλη θιγῆν βίαι; Apollod. *Eph.* 1.18 Φαῖδρα . . . κατεψεύσατο Ἰππολύτου βίαν.

5 παρθενων is followed by ο or θ and by another round letter (ε, θ, ο, c), so that one of the following articulations is possible: (i) παρθένω (whether the adjective, 'maiden', 'chaste', or the masculine noun, 'unmarried man', which could refer to Hippolytus) followed by a word beginning with νοε-, νοθ-, νοο- or νοc-; (ii) παρθένων followed by two round letters; (iii) the genitive παρθενώνος, referring to the place where Phaedra dwells.

6 πλειονος may be articulated either as πλείονος or as πλείον ος.

γει [. If an itacistic writing, perhaps part of γείνομαι. Cf. hyp. *Alc.* 5-6 μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ταύτης τῆς συμφορᾶς γενομένης (cf. below on 8).

7 πιστεύσας. Theseus believes Phaedra. That the subject is indeed Theseus is shown by P. Mich., which provides the preceding word:]ο θησευς . . . [. Already Luppe (*ZPE* 102 (1994) 25) conjectured πιστ[εύσας in P. Mich. on the basis of hyp. *Hipp.* 19 πιστεύσας δὲ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις. Cf. also Apollod. *Eph.* 1.19 Θησεὺς δὲ πιστεύσας ἠΰξαστο Ποσειδῶνι Ἰππόλυτον διαφθάρηναι; Plu. *Parall. min.* 314B Θησεὺς δὲ πιστεύσας ἠτήσατο παρὰ Ποσειδῶνος ἀπολέσθαι τὸν Ἰππόλυτον; sch. *Od.* 11.321 πιστεύσας τῆι Φαίδραι.

7-8 In the lacuna P. Mich. supplies], [.] κατὰ τοῦ παιδ[ός, and in its following line]ωνι, which Luppe (ibid.) not unreasonably proposes to restore as (κατ)ά[ρ]άτ[α] κατὰ τοῦ παιδ[ός | ἔθετο τῶι Ποσειδ[ῶ]νι. Cf. hyp. *Hipp.* 20 αὐτὸς δὲ τῶι Ποσειδῶνι ἀρὰς ἔθετο.

8 π[ολύ. P. Mich. gives]ωνι και μετ ου πολ[υ. A noun in the genitive must have followed. Cf. hyp. *Alc.* 5-6 μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ταύτης τῆς συμφορᾶς γενομένης.

9 τὸν ἀεβήσα[ντα. Cf. hyp. *Or.* 5. It must have been said from Theseus' point of view. P. Mich. continues τω[.

11 ἐκέλ[ευσε. The continuation as far as -λεν . . . [is supplied by P. Mich. The high trace of the uncertain letter there admits both λ and ε; thus subject(s) and number remain uncertain.

12]οβον. The trace best supports λ, suggesting κο]λοβόν, 'maimed', 'mutilated' (of Hippolytus himself?). Less likely palaeographically are φόβον (cf. *Hipp.* 1204, 1218: Hippolytus' horses frightened by the bull arising from the sea?) and ὄτοβος, used of any loud noise, e.g. rattling of chariots or crash of thunder (but one would expect to see the left end of the top-stroke).

13] .ιδ'. Professor Parsons suggests ἐλ]πίδ' (or, if τ, ὄ]τι δ' or ἐ]τι δ').

14 λευεν. Luppe now reads]λιαν before ἐκέλευσε[in P. Mich., proposing to restore [θεράποντά τινα νεα]ρίαν ἐκέλευσε[ν (*ZPE* 143 (2003) 24). However, R. Kannicht reads]λιαν.

15 θ[ι]και λημ[. P. Mich. gives] .ῥθιας καθικαι λη[, which Luppe proposed [ἐπὶ τῆς ἐς]τ[ῆ]θ[ί]ας καθικαι λη[ψόμενον]. But this is ruled out by 4640, which gives μ[after λη- (unless one reads λημ[ψόμενον]).

15–16 εἴ|λεγχο^ν ω^ν[. εἰλεγχο^ς occurs in *Hipp.* 1310, 1337 in the sense of ‘cross-examination’, ‘test’, or ‘proof’. In P. Mich. εἰλεγχο^ν is followed by γενομε[. If we have ὦ^ν here, this could be a case of a variant reading, more or less synonymous, implying γενομέ[ν^ος in the Michigan text. Alternatively ὦ^ν could be read, implying γενομέ[ν^ον. But the two texts may have diverged here even more than we can now tell.

18 Perhaps πατρός (presumably of Theseus, if correct).

Further Notes on P. Mich. 6222A

These concern problems where lacunae in **4640** make it impossible to tell whether the two papyri had identical phrasing. Except for fr. A, references to P. Mich. (underlined> are by the lineation of that of **4640** ii (in plain text) given in the composite text above.

1 Who is killed (κατεσφαξί)? In the extant *Hipp. II*, Phaedra kills herself immediately after writing her accusation, whereas it has been assumed for the first play that she did not commit suicide until the innocence of Hippolytus was revealed. Phaedra is probably still alive at 16 (]η μὲν Φαίδρα[) unless these words are part of a report. Is it perhaps a servant of Hippolytus (οἰ]κετῶ^ν?) who is killed by Phaedra or by someone else (sing. or plur.) at her command (i) because he tries to frustrate her plans, or (ii) as an alleged accomplice of Hippolytus’ rape?

4–5 Perhaps καὶ τὰς [θύρας --- τοῦ] παρθενῶ^νος? Cf. Apollod. *Ephit.* 1.18 κατασχίσασα τὰς τοῦ θαλάμου θύρας καὶ τὰς ἐσθήτας σπαράξασα.

6 Theseus arrives in Troezen and believes Phaedra’s accusation. The scene of the play was probably Troezen (as Luppe notes) and not Athens, as was previously assumed.

9–10 Diggle suggests τῶ^ν δ’ Ἴππολύτου δούλων ἐν[α] | λειπόμην[ον and points at *Hipp.* 6 ἔνα τῶ^ν συγγενῶ^ν and XXVII **2455** *Aeol.* 24, *Hec.* 3 and 5–6, *Heracl.* 12–13 and *Mel. Sophie* 32 (ed. H. Rabe, *RhM* n.s. 63 (1908) 145). In all these examples, the numeral precedes the genitive.

14 Cf. introduction. If]λυψάμενον is to be connected with the title Καλυπτόμενος (= *Hipp. I*), then the usual interpretation of this title, according to which Hippolytus would veil his head against the pollution of Phaedra’s proposition, is to be excluded. Alternatively we could suppose that Hippolytus’ corpse would be covered (cf. E. M. Craik, *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987) 137–9), but in this case Καλυπτόμενος must be passive, which seems less convincing.

15 ἀληθῆ. One might suppose that Theseus is about to discover the truth, which was first hidden and then revealed by Phaedra, or revealed by someone else against Phaedra’s desire. Cf. Luppe, who proposes παρὰ Φαίδρα] ἀληθῆ τῶ^ν περὶ τοῦ ἔρωτος αὐτῆς εἰ]λεγχο^ν (followed by end of sentence).

16]η μὲν Φαίδρα[. Nominative or dative?

17 ἐξήγει. The subject is unknown. Diggle suggests that Phaedra sought (ἐξήγει) to hide the truth, while a servant (θερ]άπων) declared that Theseus was the murderer of his son (18 φο]νέα τοῦ | [παιδός --- γε]νέσθαι), whereupon Theseus repented of his rashness (18–19 μ]ετανο[ήσας). But the addition of the Oxyrhynchus text to that of Michigan suggests that νεατου must come very close to . . . τρος. If πατρός is to be read, we have φο]νέα τοῦ | πατρός.

M. VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK

4641. MENANDER, *EPITREPONTES*

100/184 (a)

9 × 14.2 cm

Second/third century
Plate III

Fragment of a bookroll, papyrus broken away on at least three sides. Parts of 22 iambic trimeters survive. It is not clear whether the last line was the bottom of the column. The column-width was approximately 11.5 cm (based on the certain supplement in 13). The writing runs along the fibres and the back is blank.

The text is written in a 'Biblical uncial' script very similar to that of **Π 224** (= P. Lond. Lit. 76) and P. Ryl. III 547 and **LXII 4302**. G. Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (1967) 28–9 with pll. 6 and 7a, assigns **224** and P. Ryl. 547 (perhaps from a single roll) to the end of the second century; we would think the third century equally probable. In **4641** note the heavy contrast between the thick uprights and the thin, almost invisible horizontals.

Sense breaks are marked by high (10, 11) and middle stops, inserted at a later stage. Elision is generally unmarked, sometimes marked by apostrophe in combination with a middle stop (7 [twice], 12, all additions and perhaps by a second hand); no certain instance of *scriptio plena* is to be found. Diaeresis once marks a word beginning with ι (15). Iota adscript is written twice (3, 11), omitted once but there added as a correction (9). 'Itacism' is corrected once (3). The writer, apparently concentrating on his calligraphy, produces a text which is frequently corrected by deletion of letters and/or supralinear additions (3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, possibly 11, 16, 17, 22), which may or may not be by the same hand. Part-division is indicated once by dicolon together with a *nota personae* (19), which was added above the line in a different and very small hand. Paragraphoi are expected, but cannot be seen because of the missing line-beginnings.

The attribution to Menander's *Epitrepontes* is based on an overlap with the indirectly transmitted fr. 6 of this play in 13–15. The character name Syriskos (19) and the content of the dialogue in 16ff. place the fragment beyond reasonable doubt in the early scenes of Act II, just a few lines before the beginning of the Cairo Codex (*Ep.* 218ff.). The new fragment shows not only that the title-scene of the play starts approximately 10 lines earlier, but also helps to explain better the arbitration itself (see 20–21 n.). In addition, the fragment contains further evidence that the name of the charcoal-burner is indeed Syriskos (see 19 n.).

.

] ουτ νθυγατερ[
]δηλεγομενονη[
] επείκηικαρτερης[
] ντομηπαράτουτο . [

5] νπεπο[[ι]]ηκεμυριου[
] ον[[δ]] γέτοκακονειδεης[
] λεγοντ' ασωτοσειμ' ου[
] ζτα μεθυωκραπαλω[
] .[. .] δουναντωίφρασων[

10] ειρανπροσαγέ' νωνννα[
] θειελεγειτουτωιγαρε[
] ρχαζετ' ερωσθαιγαρεστ . [
] γοδυγ . νωντουπυρ[

- 15 μ₁άτην· ἰδεῖν βουλῆσομ' αὐ[τὸν
 (ΔΑ.) π]ροσμεῖνατ', ὧ δειλῆς μετὰ[
 (CΥ.) ἔρ]ρωσο καὶ τὸ κατὰ σὲ πρόσομ[εῖνον μόνον.
 π]αρ' ἔνα γὰρ ἔσθ' ἕκαστον ἢ σφ[τηρία.
 (ΔΑ.) ο]υθ' ἐν λέγεις δίκαιον. CYPICK(OC) οὐ μα[
 20 ]εῖ πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην [.]
 ]ον. κατοικεῖ δ' ἐνθα[δ
 ]. [.]μ₁εν οἴκε. . . οὐ[

SMIKRINES(?) . . . daughter . . . as the saying goes . . . persuade . . . hold out . . . not to . . . from such a . . . (5) he has made countless . . . the problem, if necessary . . . (Charisios) saying 'I am a profligate man . . . I am drunk, I am partying (or: I have a hangover)' . . . Should I tell him to make an attempt, as now . . . since [no one] says to this . . . is working . . . for being healthy . . . A healthy idler is far worse off than one in bed with a fever: he eats twice as much — in vain! — I want to see [him]. . .

DAOS (*to Syriskos and his wife, all entering the stage*) Wait! — what an afternoon! . . .

SYRISKOS Goodbye, and as far as you are concerned: [just *you* wait]. For everyone is himself responsible for his [salvation].

DAOS What you're saying is not just.

SYRISKOS Not . . . to my master . . . He lives here . . .

Act II of the *Epitrepontes* is in general believed to have opened with a monologue by Onesimos (six line-beginnings preserved: *Ep.* 173–8), followed by a dialogue scene, in which Onesimos lied to Smikrines (cf. Gomme-Sandbach p. 302), e.g. by telling him that he would find Charisios in the *agora* (cf. 15 n.).

1–15 (soliloquy) The speaker cannot be identified with certainty. Neither of the two possible candidates, Onesimos and Smikrines, is conclusively recommended or ruled out by the content of the lines. However, external evidence is in favour of Smikrines: towards the end of Act I, he left the stage with the announcement (*Ep.* 161–3): εἴσειμι δ' οὖν εἴω, σαφῶς τε πυθόμενος | ἄ]παντα τ[αῦ]τα τῆς θυγατρὸς, βουλευόμεμαι | ὄντινα τ]ρόπον πρὸς τοῦτον (sc. Χαρίσιον) ἤδη προσβαλῶ. According to Menander's normal dramatic technique (for references see E. Handley in *Relire Ménandre* (Geneva 1990) 132 n. 17; 140 n. 29), one expects Smikrines to explain the result of this plan in a monologue in an early scene of Act II. If however Onesimos is the speaker of 1–15, Smikrines would enter the stage in *Ep.* 222 without ever coming back to his plans to attack Charisios. It seems therefore preferable to make Smikrines the speaker. The following commentary is based on this hypothesis.

1 θυγατέρ[α (rather than -ρ[ας, -ρ[ων, θύγατερ): Pamphile, Smikrines' daughter. Before that probably] τούτων.

2 τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον: 'as the saying goes', LSJ s.v. λέγω III 10; cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles* 235 (with examples). E.g. τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον ἦ[ττων (Austin); cf. *Ep.* 666–7 (= fr. com. adesp. 78.2–3 K.–A.; see *ZPE* 128 (1999) 54–6): τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον | ἦττων ἑαυτοῦ (Smikrines about Charisios). Or τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον ἦ[δικτος/-ν βίος/-ν; cf. *Ep.* 680: μισεῖ τὸν ἠδὲν λεγόμενον τοῦτον βίον; (Smikrines about Charisios). Handley suggests ἐγὼ τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον ἦ[δὲς ἦν. τί οὖν; comparing Pl. *Gorg.* 491^c2, *Euthyd.* 300^a6, *R.* 337^d6, and *Sam.* 412 (Smikrines referring to the conversation he had with Pamphile during the act-break).

3 E.g. μηδὲν] σὲ πείσει, καρτέρησ[ον, Cμικρήν] (for καρτέρησον cf. *Sam.* 356, also 327; for this kind of self-address: J. Blundell, *Menander and the Monologue* (Göttingen 1980) 65ff.): Smikrines envisages a conversation (the subject of πείσει probably being Charisios), in which he is to stand his ground.

4 Probably a neuter adjective (e.g. ἀγαθὸν) τὸ μὴ παρὰ τοῦ τοι[ούτου + infinitive (e.g. λαβεῖν in 5): ‘it is [good] not to [take] . . . from such a man’. For substantival ὁ τοιοῦτος, cf. K.–G. i 631, here probably referring to Charisios.

5 πεπόηκε μυρίου[ς: cf. *Ep.* 683 Martina (Smikrines about Charisios) π[ολλὰς πεπο[ί]κεν [. . .]]ουκ | οἶ]τος ὁ γος[ὼν] λεκ[.].

6 εἰ δεή[ς]ει: cf. Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.4, also *Sam.* 289 (though interrogative, not conditional); R. Kassel compares indignant εἰ δεῖ in Ar. *Ra.* 1007, *Ecll.* 1098.

6–7 Most likely a neuter adjective with κακόν at the beginning of 6 and an infinitive at the end, e.g. (sarcastic) καλ]όν γε τὸ κακόν, εἰ δεή[ς]ει μ’ ὑπομένειν (Handley) | αὐτὸ]ν λέγοντ’ “ἄσωτός εἴμ’ κτλ.”: Smikrines envisages what Charisios might answer in reply if he were to confront him. It is noteworthy that Smikrines does not envisage a belligerent Charisios. The passage is mirrored in *Ep.* 927ff., where Charisios envisages a confrontation with Smikrines. Sarcasm is common with Smikrines: see *Ep.* 655ff., 680, 693 and below.

7 λέγοντ(α) as introduction of quoted speech: fr. 25.6 K.–A. (= 23.6 K.–T.) and Philippides fr. 27 K.–A., and in general R. Nünlist, ‘Speech within Speech in Menander’, in A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Comedy* (Oxford 2002) 219–59.

ἄσωτος: cf. *Ep.* 584 (Smikrines about Charisios), *Her.* 60, fr. 544.2 K.–A. (= 800.2 K.–T.).

7–8 E.g. οὐ [γὰρ τὰδε | γελα]στά; (Austin; a comment by Smikrines interrupting the quoted speech, witness the stops in the papyrus). ψ[represents the high tip of an oblique descending from left to right; φ[might also be thought of (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 3.9.63 . . . ὀμοφαγίαν, ἄσωτίαν . . .).

8 μεθύω, κραπαλῶ: cf. Lucian *Bis accus.* 16 δε . . . ψαλτρίας ἔχων καὶ καταιδόμενος ἔωθεν εἰς ἐσπέραν, μεθύων ἀεὶ καὶ κραπαλῶν καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῖς στεφάνοις διηθιμιμέος. On the meaning of κραπαλῶ see Arnott on Alexis fr. 287.1 K.–A. For the asyndeton cf. *Dysk.* 59–60, 547–9. The quoted speech probably ends in 8. At the end of the line e.g. [στεφάνους φορῶ (Austin, comparing the passage in Lucian) or [πόρνης ἐρῶ.

9 At line beginning I had thought of a participle, e.g. παρ]ή[ν]τι δ’ οὖν, ‘Should I tell him to his face . . .?’; cf. *Sam.* 626. But although]τι by itself could fit the traces, the reading does not account for a trace at mid-height to the right of the presumed ι, unless that is accidental (compare the unexplained dots in 14 δ·ιπ and 20 δ·εε).

αὐτῶι φράσω *Sam.* 155.

At the end Austin suggests ν[έαν τινά.

10 π[είραν προσάγειν: the phrase seems to have sexual overtones (cf. Ach. Tat. 1.10.5, Liban. *or.* 42.29, also Lucian *dial. deor.* 3.2): ‘Should I tell him . . . to make yet another pass?’(?) At the end e.g. ὡς νῦν ἀ[κολαστοτέρως] ἔχει (Austin); cf. Xen. *mem.* 2.1.1.

11 Probably ο]ὔθεις (ὠ]θειεῖς and ὀ]θειεῖς being unlikely). E.g. ο]ὔθεις λέγει τούτῳι γάρ, “ε[ὐγενής (vel sim.: εὐβουλός Austin, εὐτυχής Gronewald) τις ὢν (Handley) | ἐ]ργάζετ(αι)”. The assumption of quoted speech is based on the stops after γαρ and εργαζετ; cf. 7. γάρ comes late in the sentence (4th place), as often in Menander and other late authors (Dover, *Greek and the Greeks* (London 1987) 61–3; Handley on *Dysk.* 66–8).

12 ἐρρῶσθαι: ‘being healthy’ (cf. ὑγιαίνων, 13), often in medical writers. E.g. ἐρρῶσθαι γάρ ἐστ[ί] [μὲν καλόν, giving an antecedent to ἀργός δ’ ὑγιαίνων κτλ.

13–15 = Men. *Ep.* fr. 6 (Stobaios 3.30.7; cf. also Theophyl. Simoc. *epist.* 61, *Epigr. Bob.* 49 and Joh. Chrysostomos, *In illud: Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam* 51.195.20). Smikrines as speaker of this gnome had already been suggested by Wilamowitz and others. The gnome seems to convey a sarcastic tone again (ἀθλιώτερος).

14–15 διπλάσια γ’ ἔεθίει | μάτην: the papyrus has the same word order as the MSS of Stobaios, which provide an unmetrical διπλάσια γοῦν ἐεθίει | μάτην, emended by Wilamowitz, *NJA* 11 (1908) 53 n. 1, (and most subsequent editors) to μάτην γοῦν ἐεθίει | διπλάσια. With the end of the line missing, one cannot exclude with certainty that the papyrus did not contain the same corruption, which then would be proven to be very old. In the light of the new fragment, it seems however preferable to retain the transmitted word order (with an effective runover word μάτην), and to emend Stobaios’ text as printed (so already C. Robert, *Der neue Menander* (Berlin 1908) 88). The corruption in Stobaios has been explained by Buecheler (Stobaios, ed. Hense, vol. 3, p. lxxix) as an incorporation of a variant διπλοῦν/διπλάσια, ΟΥΝ being written over ΑC1A and erroneously interpreted as correction (for this kind of error cf. e.g. *Dysk.* 26, 958).

15 For the future cf. Austin on *Asp.* 93, and more in general S. Radt in *CXOIA (Festschrift Holwerda)* (Groningen 1985) 109–12 (R. Kassel).

ιδεῖν: ‘see’ ≈ ‘meet’ as often in Menander (Handley on *Dysk.* 305). Smikrines’ announcement that he wishes to talk to Charisios can fulfil different dramatic purposes (with different restorations): (i) the announcement of an immediate exit to the agora: κατ’ ἀγοράν/ἐν ἀγορᾷ (Gronewald), assuming that Onesimos lied to Smikrines in the preceding (lost) scene (see above) in order to protect his master (cf. Onesimos’ fear in *Ep.* 577 ff.). The announcement of an exit into Chairestratos’ house is less likely: in *Ep.* 371 Smikrines exits to the city, and the preceding arbitration scene does not contain a clue that he has changed his plans; (ii) the announcement of a later conversation with Charisios: ὅσπερον (P. Brown, Austin, who compares in general *Asp.* 93 f. εἶτ’ ἐντυχεῖν βουλήκομαί τι Δᾶέ σοι | κατὰ χολήν), or κατὰ μόνας (Handley, comparing *Dysk.* 782). In any case, Smikrines (probably on the right-hand side of the stage) is interrupted by the entrance of the slaves (from the left) in 16, until he is asked to act as their arbitrator in *Ep.* 222. Handley suggests he may have said something like μικρὸν ὑπαποστήσομαι (*Sam.* 368) in the (probably short) gap before *Ep.* 218 ff.

16 Enter from the left (= country-side) Syriskos, Syriskos’ wife (mute) with child, pursued by Daos (for the reasons of his pursuit see 20–21n.). That the character who enters second speaks first has a parallel in Ter. *Ad.* 155 ff. (P. Brown). The present passage should settle the question how to reconstruct the passage in *Ad.* (see Lowe, *CQ* 48 (1998) 477 n. 38, against Rosivach, *CQ* 23 (1973) 85–7).

π]ροσμεῖνατ(ε): cf. *Mis.* 462, also *Ep.* 365, 858.

ὦ δειλῆς (so rather than ὦ δειλῆς): cf. *Sam.* 429 ὦ μακρὰς δειλῆς (Moschion complaining that things are not proceeding fast enough, whereas here Daos seems to express his distress in general). E.g. ὦ δειλῆς μετα[τρόπου, μεῖνατε (Handley, comparing *Ep.* 878 and Arnott on Alexis, *Asotodidaskalos* 4), or μετα[πιπτούσης κακῶς (Austin). If it is already (early) afternoon, the cook is indeed slow (cf. *Ep.* 382–4). For the time-scale of *Ep.* see Arnott, *ζPE* 70 (1987) 19–31 (with add. *ζPE* 72 (1988) 26) against Sandbach, *LCM* 11 (1986) 156–8.

17 ἔρ]ρωσο: cf. *Georg.* 84, *Dysk.* 213, LIX 3969 11 (= fr. com. adesp. 1142 K.–A.): spoken by or to a character who is leaving the stage; here a provocative dismissal of Daos, who does not co-operate. Syriskos dismisses him with a thinly veiled threat (‘Goodbye, and just you wait for what’s coming to you’; cf. 20–21 n.).

τὸ κατὰ σέ: adverbial (always sg.; the supralinear variant in the papyrus is to be preferred); cf. Hdt. 1.124.2 τὸ δὲ κατὰ θεοῦς τε καὶ ἐμέ, 7.158.2 τὸ τε κατ’ ὑμέας, and Schwyzer–Debrunner ii 477.

18 Cf. X. *Hipp.* 1.5 πολλοῖς ἤδη ἢ σωτηρία παρὰ τούτο ἐγένετο, Isocr. 6.52 ὠμολογεῖτο παρὰ τούτον (sc. τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον) γενέσθαι τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτοῖς, Lycurg. 63–4 οὐδὲν ἂν παρ’ ἕνα ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο τούτων . . . παρὰ τούτον εἶναι τῆι πόλει τὴν σωτηρίαν. On this type of παρὰ (εἶναι/γίνεσθαι), see K.–G. i 513–14 and H. Wankel, *Demosthenes: Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* (Heidelberg 1976) 1039 (R. Kassel).

19 ο]ῦθῆν λέγει δίκαιον: R. Kassel compares οὐδὲν ὕγιες . . . λέγει (Ar. *Thesm.* 636; cf. E. *Cycl.* 259) and | οὐδὲν φρονεῖ δίκαιον (fr. com. adesp. 520 K.–A., probably a parody of tragic verse); δίκαιον is a real catch-word in this play, especially for Syriskos (218, 233, 249, 348, 352). At the end e.g. οὐ μ’ ἀ[ποστρέφεις. The raised final kappa of *χυριε*‘ apparently ends in a flat tail prolonged well to the right. Below the main part of kappa, and to the upper right of the epsilon below, is ink shaped like ^l, which I cannot explain either as a sign (too far to the right for a rough breathing) or as a correcting letter (although some horizontal ink touching the epsilon just below its junction might be taken as a deletion-stroke).

The *nota personae* is further evidence against the Mytilene mosaic, which gives the name as Syros and attributes it to the wrong character (cf. Gomme–Sandbach on *Ep.* 270; for the mosaic *ζPE* 126 (1999) 75–6). Syrisk(os) in the identification seems to indicate that this is how the name appeared in the cast-list. It may originally be a *Kösnamen* (so Arnott, *CQ* 18 (1968) 227 ff.), but Syriskos is a regular name in Athens and elsewhere (cf. *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* I–II, s.v.).

20–21 Syriskos’ words most likely contain a threat to bring the case before his master Chairestratos. Since a slave cannot himself take legal action (D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 81), Chairestratos is imagined to do this on Syriskos’ behalf. Syriskos will have made clear his intentions after his failure to get the trinkets from Daos (cf. *Ep.* 275 ff.). This threat of legal action is the reason why Daos actually pursues Syriskos (and does not rather stay at home since he still is in possession of the trinkets). His exclamation *κυκοφαντεῖς*

δυστυχής (*Ep.* 218) is therefore to be understood in a specifically legal sense (on sycophants see e.g. MacDowell, *op. cit.* 62). It follows that the arbitration for which the two slaves eventually settle (*Ep.* 219 ff.) appears to be a form of compromise and not Syriskos' original intention. (Cf. A. Scafuro, *The Forensic Stage* (Cambridge 1997) 179, on Pl. *Circ.* 686–729 and arbitration in general: 'The arbitration, moreover, arises out of a typically Athenian sequence amply attested in the orators, the threat of a suit precedes the offer of arbitration.')

Two basic restorations of the lines are conceivable: (i) Syriskos threatens Daos directly, e.g. ἐγὼ δ]ε πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην [τραπήσομαι | τὸν ἐμ]όν. κατοικεῖ δ' ἐνθά[δι Χαιρέστρατος (Austin). (ii) Syriskos threatens Daos indirectly by addressing his wife, e.g. ἔνεγκε]ε πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην [τὸ παιδίον; cf. *Ep.* 376–8 (Syriskos speaking) εὐ δὲ ταυτί (sc. τὰ γνωρίσματα), γύναι, | λαβοῦσα πρὸς τὸν τρόφιμον ἐνθάδ' εἰσφέρει | Χαιρέστρατον. For δεσπότης/τρόφιμος referring to the same character cf. *Dysk.* 300 and 378; for ἔνεγκε at the beginning of the line cf. *Sam.* 660.

21 κατοικεῖ δ' ἐνθά[δ] or the like: cf. *Perik.* 122–3 τὴν οἰκίαν . . . κατοικοῦσθαι.

22]μεν: possibly 1st person pl., e.g. ἀλλ' εἰς[ω]μεν (*Mis.* 451; cf. 264).

The assumption of quoted speech in lines 7–8 and 11–12 coincides with one of the interpretations of LX 4021 fr. 3, for which the first editor tentatively suggested a placing between *Ep.* 178 and 218 (adopted in Martina's edition). Although the two fragments do not overlap, it is possible to place both fragments in the gap (LX 4021 fr. 3 coming first, whose speaker would then be Onesimos). It has to be remembered that there is no external evidence for the commonly assumed length of the gap (40 lines), which is based on the assumption that Menandrian acts normally do not exceed 250 lines. However, it is also conceivable that LX 4021 fr. 3 comes before *Ep.* 127 (the speaker being Chairestratos, not, as suggested in the ed. pr., Smikrines). A discussion of LX 4021 fr. 3 (with an improved text) is to follow shortly in *ZPE*.

A placing before *Ep.* 218 has also tentatively been suggested for the six unplaced fragments of XXXVIII 2829 (fr. V–X). Attempts to connect any of them with the new fragment have so far failed.

R. NÜNLIST

4642. ?MENANDER, *KITHARISTES*?

12 1B.137/H(b)

10.8 × 12 cm

Late first/early second century
Plate IV

The papyrus preserves the upper margin to a height of 3 cm, but is broken away on the other sides. Three lines are virtually complete. The width of the column was c.9 cm. Minimal traces of a previous column survive; the intercolumnium measures c.2.3 cm. The back is blank and the writing runs along the fibres.

The text is written in a rounded upright capital of medium size, rather informal and generally bilinear (ϕ projects, α and λ may). ε θ ο c tend to be broad (and the cross-bar of ε is often not joined to the curve); the horizontal of τ is often broken, the right-hand element written separately from the left and lower down. The writing may be compared with P. Lond. Lit. 6 (*Iliad*) = Seider II 21, Taf. XI, datable to the earlier first century AD (a Domitianic document on the verso), but that is cruder and probably earlier; and with the two hands of V 841 (Pindar, *Paeans*; Roberts, *GLH* pl. 14), datable probably to the mid second century (the document on the recto dates after 81). In general appearance it is similar to LXII 4306 (mythological compendium), which the editor assigns to the first/second century AD.

Part-division is indicated by paragraphoi and spaces. Two speakers are identified with *notae personarum* (5), one in the left margin, the other above the line. The names are written very small in a slightly more cursive style, but may be by the same hand. Elision is indicated twice by apostrophe (3, 13, but not in 7, 8). One accent is found in 3. No indication for *scriptio plena*, (missing) iota adscript or iotacism.

The character-name Phantias is known from Menander's *Kitharistes* and fr. adesp. 1141 K.–A. (tentatively attributed to *Kith.*). A Phantia is also mentioned (but is not a *dramatis persona*) in three plays by Terence (*Andr.*, *HT*, *Hec.*; see W. G. Arnott, *Menander* (Loeb) ii 143, with further references to non-dramatic texts). Parmenon as a slave's name is very common. Those parts of the fragment which are sufficiently intelligible do not rule out an attribution to *Kitharistes* and could be fitted into a hypothetical reconstruction of that play (see at the end of the commentary).

col. i	col. ii
	top
]αφ.ρ.ζτιςεστινουτοσουκεγω.[
]αιπραγματοκοπειφανιασοδιδα.[
]αν.γ'άντιωσαληθωσελπτις[
	. [.] . . τοςημιναυτονο . . . θ.σιον[
5]ανι ^ι <u>εορα</u> κας ^{παρ^η} ειδον ωπολυτιμητο[
	<u>καιφ</u> [.]λτατεζευωτερωσπολληχ[
	<u>τιον</u> νυγαινουσινμεν οσαγουτω.[
	τηναιτιαντινελεγονειναι[
	/ τοπλ.ιονεισκητηνηκατε.[
10	εκριθ.[. . .] . . μ . . . νκαιδιενεχ[
]ξενοστισαν[c.8]ε.[
]χθησανπροδοσιαςχενομ[
].σμ'επεπλευσεγαρτις . . [
].ουτοςπαλιν.[
15].ηκουσενα.[
]ησαν[

col. ii

1 traces compatible with γλ]αφυρος (Handley) . [, λ likelier than μ (Handley) 2 . [, a trace at mid-height compatible with c 4 . [, small arc at line-level, lower left corner of round letter or the like] . . , the upper half of a circle; then the foot of an upright and an upper right-hand corner:]οϚ? ο . . . θ.ς, after ο the foot of an upright, then a cross-bar, possibly of τ, connecting relatively low with a projecting ι as for

example in 3 $\tau\iota\epsilon$; the trace after θ suggests η , except for the horizontal trace next to the following ϵ , which could however be a ligature as elsewhere in this hand (e.g. 8 $\tau\eta\eta$). Therefore possibly $\sigma\upsilon\tau\iota\theta\eta\epsilon$ 7 .[, possibly ϵ with a flat top (cf. 13) 9 a diagonal stroke in the left margin, ascending from left to right $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$.[, the foot and a trace at mid-height of an upright, then a minimal trace at the edge of the papyrus: either ι .[or η .[, but not π .[10] . μ . ν ., the first trace is the right-hand end of Δ , λ or μ ; then the lower part of an arc: ϵ , σ ; the right-hand end of μ connects with the foot of an upright; then the lower part of an arc: ϵ , σ . Therefore possibly $\pi\sigma\lambda\epsilon\mu\sigma\upsilon\tau$ 11] ϵ .[, upright: ι , Γ or η 13] ., an upright: ι , η $\tau\iota\epsilon$, left-hand arc with no trace of cross-bar: ϵ , σ , ω .[, a trace at the bottom line and a projecting high oblique, perhaps to be combined as λ , Δ or Δ , possibly μ 14] ., an upright, most likely η 15] ., trace of a curve slightly above the bottom line, touching the η : μ , λ , κ or Δ . At the end possibly $\lambda\gamma$.[

col. ii

$\gamma\lambda$]αφυρός τις ἔστιν οὗτος. οὐκ ἐγὼ ἄλ[εγον;

ν]αί· πραγματοκοπεῖ Φανίας ὁ διδάς[καλος.

ἄπ]αντὰ γ' ἂν τις ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐλπίς[αι

. [.] . . . τοσ ἡμῖν αὐτὸν ο . . . θ . ζ ἴσον.

5 ΦΑΝΙΑ(C) ἑώρακας; ΠΑΡΜ(ΕΝΩΝ) εἶδον. (ΦΑ.) ὦ πολυτίμητο[ι θεοί

καὶ φ[ί]λτατε Ζεῦ Σῶτερ, ὡς πολλή χ[άρις.

τί οὖν; ὑγιαίνουσιν μὲν; (ΠΑ.) ὅσα γ' οὕτως [ιδεῖν.

(ΦΑ.) τὴν αἰτίαν τίν' ἔλεγον εἶναι [

(ΠΑ.) τὸ πλοῖον εἰς Κρήτην κατε. [

10 ἐκριθῆ[. . .] . μ . ν καὶ διενεχ[

× - ∪ -] ξένος τις αὐ[ϵ 8] ϵ . [

× - ∪ -] χθῆσαν προδοσίας γενομ[ένη

× - ∪] . ζ μ' ἐπέπλευσε γάρ τις . . [

] . οὗτος πάλιν . [

15] . ἤκουσεν α . [

] ησαν[

. . . An astute person is this man. Didn't I say it before? Yes; the teacher Phantias is meddling. Truly, one could expect anything at all . . . him equal to us.

PHANIAS (*entering the stage*) Have you seen (them)?

PARMENON I have!

(PH.) O much-honoured gods and you my best friend, Zeus Saviour! How great is my gratitude! Well then: are they safe?

(PA.) As far as I can see now.

(PH.) What did they say the reason was for . . . ?

(PA.) The ship . . . to Crete . . . it was decided (?) . . . a stranger . . . them (?) . . . they [sailed away] (?), after a betrayal had taken place . . . for there was a (. . .) on the (same?) ship . . . this man again . . . heard . . .

1–4 The lines ought to come from a monologue (three-actor rule). The speaker cannot be identified. He appears to be opposed to Phantias. The lines do not contain one of the typical formulas to announce an impending entry (cf. K. B. Frost, *Exits and Entrances in Menander* (Oxford 1988) 5f.). The speaker seems to be unaware of Phantias and Parmenon approaching the stage, but he unknowingly prepares for their entry (cf. Frost, op. cit. 11f.). Whether he leaves the stage in 4 (resulting in an empty stage) or remains on stage as an eavesdropper cannot be decided.

1 γλ]αφυρός: cf. fr. 531 K.–A. (not in K.–T.), where the word is glossed with εὐτράπελος; in the light of 2 it is likely to be contemptuous ('glib') or ironic.

ἐγὼ ἄ[εγον Handley (cf. Men. *Dysk.* 172, 511, *Mis.* 217, always at the end of the line).

2 ν]αί: Handley.

πραγματοκοπέι: cf. Polybios 29.23.10; 38.13.8 (also Philodem. *Rh.* 2.53 Sudhaus, and for the noun *ibid.* 1.226); the word has negative connotations ('to interfere, meddle in a business').

Φανίας: For the attestations of this name in (Greek) Comedy see introduction above.

3 Possibly a (rhetorical) question (cf. *Dysk.* 203). The referent of τικ is then Phantias and the implication is that he should be content with what he already has. As an alternative, Handley suggests taking 3 as an apodosis with 4 (see next note).

4 Probably: subject + ἡμῶν αὐτὸν (sc. Phantias) οὐ τῖθης' ἴσον, e.g. ὁ [πλ]οῦτος ('his wealth does not make him equal to us'), which suits the initial trace but is difficult to reconcile with the spacing, [πλ] being rather long. Or (Handley): [. . .] . . . τος ἡμῶν αὐτὸν οὐ τῖθης' ἴσον, '(Everything can be expected, it really can) where x places himself as our equal' (in that case consider τ[οι]οῦτος J. R. Rea).

5 Enter Phantias and his (?) slave Parmenon in mid-conversation (for this type of entry Frost, op. cit. 10f.). On the new entry, each speaker is once identified by a *nota personae* in the papyrus, written small and abbreviated in suspension (φ]ανί, the final suprascript alpha in the cursive form ι, παρ^μ with μ written above ρ). The apparent absence of (identifying) vocatives indicates that it is not their first appearance on stage.

ἐόρακα: cf. Men. *Sam.* 61 (also opening a scene in mid-conversation); the most likely object is the persons about whose condition Phantias interrogates Parmenon in 7. For this juxtaposition of perf. and aor. of δράω referring to the same event, cf. *Dysk.* 409–11.

ὁ πολυτίμητο[ι θεοί: cf. Men. *Asp.* 408, *Dysk.* 202, 381, 479, *Mis.* 165, Fab. inc. 56, fr. 106.2 K.–A. (97.2 K.–T.), 508.5 K.–A. (718.5 K.–T.), also Ar. *V.* 1001 (only here not at the end of the line); the oath is confined to male speakers (Handley and Gomme–Sandbach on *Dysk.* 202).

6 Ζεῦ Cώτερ: cf. Men. *Dysk.* 690, *Ep.* 907, fr. 420.7 K.–A. (656.7 K.–T.), fr. 804.2 K.–A. (581.2 K.–T.), also *Ep.* 359, *Perik.* 759, *Sam.* 310, fr. adesp. 1017.107, 1089.10, 1155.6 K.–A. For the accumulation of invocations, cf. e.g. *Dysk.* 191–2. Since the salvation seems to be related to a sea voyage (ll. 9ff.), probably a specific reference to the god of the sailor (Men. fr. 420.7 K.–A.; Posidipp. *ep.* 11.10 G–P; Diph. fr. 42.24–5 K.–A.).

χ[άρις Obbink; 'How great is the gratitude (I owe you)!' (cf. τοῖς θεοῖς πολλή χάρις Xen. *Oecon.* 8.16, Luc. *Dial. Mer.* 9.1) rather than 'How great a favour (you've done me)'.

7 τί οὖν; frequent in Menander and elsewhere, 'leading to the main point' (Handley on *Dysk.* 823).

ὕγιαίνουσι μέν; cf. Ar. *Av.* 1214 ὑγιαίνει μέν; on the force of μέν Denniston, *Greek Particles* 367, quotes Verrall 'μέν in an interrogative sentence as elsewhere marks the proposition as preliminary and points to the sequel' and Hadley 'it (sc. μέν) generally implies that unless the answer is "yes", the discussion cannot go on'.

For ὅσον/ὅσα γε + inf. cf. K.–G. ii 511 n. 3 ('meistens in einschränkendem Sinne'), Goodwin § 778, quoting e.g. Ar. *Pax* 856 (ὅσα γ' ὀδ' ἰδεῖν).

8 For the deferred interrogative cf. Men. *Asp.* 369, *Dysk.* 114 etc., and in general Thomson, *CQ* 33 (1939)

147–52, esp. 147: ‘the effect of postponing the interrogative is to reduce its force, and this is accompanied in most cases by a corresponding increase of the word which has supplanted it’.

At the end e.g. [τοῦ χρόνου] (‘delay’, LSJ s.v. iv; cf. *Kith.* 45) or [τοῦ πάθους] (Handley).

9–16 Despite the missing line-beginnings, the speaker of these lines is almost certainly to be identified with Parmenon, who gives a report about the *αἰτία* (8) in a monologue (possibly interrupted by short questions). The oblique stroke in the left-hand margin of 9 remains unexplained. To its left there is a space, and then faint traces which might represent π, i.e. π[λ]/ for Π[α](ρμένων). But the note would be in a larger hand than in 5, and differently abbreviated; most likely the apparent π is no more than dirt caught in the damaged surface.

9 Perhaps τὸ πλοῖον εἰς Κρήτην κατεῖ[χετ], ‘the ship went to Crete and was detained there’ (Handley, with reference to his note on *Dysk.* 174 ff.).

10 Perhaps ἐκρίθη [πο]λέμιον, ‘(the ship) was judged to be the enemy’s’.

11 τικ: We have doubtfully transcribed κ, assuming that the ink which closes the right-hand side is an accident. But it must be admitted that, apart from a little blotting, the ink and the ductus both suggest a normally formed ο. In that case, we must reckon with τί ἀύ[τός] (written in *scriptio plena*).

12 e.g. ἀνή]χθησαν.

προδοσίακ: the noun is not attested in Menander (for the verb cf. *Perik.* 468), but in Eupolis fr. 192.192 K.–A.

13] . κυ’: almost certainly a noun ending in -ηγμα or -ιμα.

Plot reconstruction:

(i) An unidentified character ‘A’ expresses criticism about the glib and interfering teacher Phantias. (ii) ‘A’ thinks that Phantias should be content with what he already has(?). For he will never be the same as those to whom ‘A’ belongs — despite his wealth(?). (iii) Phantias is very anxious about a group of persons. (iv) He is more than happy, when he hears that (v) Parmenon has seen them. (vi) As far as Parmenon knows, they are safe and sound. (vii) The reason for Phantias’ anxiety was a delay, presumably of a ship’s arrival. — The subsequent points are more conjectural: (viii) The ship went to Crete and was detained there(?). There it was considered to be the enemy’s(?). (ix) This forced the passengers to take refuge(?) with a *xenos*. (x) After a betrayal(?) by the *xenos*(?) they had to flee(?). (xi) A passenger on the same ship helped them(?) and made them return safely(?) to the place where the action takes place(?).

Possible connections with the *Kitharistes*: (iii) and (vii) would go nicely together with *Kith.* 44 ff., where the lyre-player Phantias expresses his anxiety about his wife and his daughter who had left Ephesos before him, but have not yet arrived in Athens (or are staying in a place unknown to him). Parmenon’s qualified answer (vi) could obliquely refer to the fact that Phantias’ daughter is pregnant, whether Parmenon already knows this or not (dramatic irony). (Moschion, the son of Phantias’ neighbour, had raped her on the occasion of a festival for Artemis in Ephesos: *Kith.* 92 ff.) The detention in Crete (ix) could account for the late arrival of Phantias’ relatives. As for (xi), it is noteworthy that Phantias’ family has possibly returned to Athens on the same ship as Moschion (so Webster, *Introduction to Menander* (Manchester 1974) 157; differently Arnott, *ZPE* 31 (1978) 27, on the basis of the very lacunose ll. 1–27; but even if Arnott is right about κατέλιπεκ (*Kith.* 10), it is not at all clear at what point Moschion ‘deserted’ Phantias’ daughter and whether he has ‘returned’ to her, i.e. wants to marry her (again)). Later in the play, Moschion (or a slave who accompanied him) may then have emphasized his role in ‘rescuing’ the women, in order to make Phantias more favourable to the idea of marrying his daughter to Moschion.

Possible objections to the attribution: (a) The plot connections are not very strong and partly dependent on hypothetical reconstructions. (b) The name Phantias is known from other sources. (c) Nothing in the extant fragments of *Kitharistes* points to Phantias as being a *teacher* (but see next paragraph).

If the attribution to *Kitharistes* is correct, the critical character ‘A’ may be identical with the speaker in *Kith.* fr. 5 and especially fr. 6 where he seems to question Phantias’ skills as a lyre-player (therefore διδάκκαλος sarcastically?).

4643. MENANDER, *HYMNIS?*

A 6153/4(C4)

4.6 × 15.8 cm

First/second century
Plate III

A strip of papyrus with a 2 cm upper margin and remains of 23 lines. The writing is along the fibres; the back is blank. The round, calligraphic hand, bilinear except for φ (ϕ does not occur), looks forward to the ‘Roman Uncial’ manner, but with a certain awkwardness in the formation of letters and in the deployment of serifs; among letter-shapes, note the capital α, z as two horizontal elements connected by an upright stem, γ with its upper part splayed and flattened, φ whose heart-shaped roundel fills the line. It looks later than XXIV 2387 (*GMAW*² 15), Alcman, which is assigned to the late first century BC/early first century AD, and earlier than classic examples of ‘Roman Uncial’ like the Hawara Homer (*GMAW*² 13). We would place it in the later first century AD or possibly the earlier second century. The only punctuation surviving is dicolon. The scribe wrote iota adscript in the two places that require it (9?, 19).

Another, much smaller, hand has written abbreviated character-names after and above the dicola in 2, 3 and 9. Two of these tiny notes (2 and 9) begin certainly or probably with υ, which points provisionally to Menander’s *Hymnis*, as no other comic name at present known starts with upsilon. Ten book fragments (*PCG* vi ii pp. 227–30) reveal less about the plot of this play than Caecilius’ adaptation (Ribbeck, *CRF* (1898³) pp. 52–4). ‘Hymnis’ is a girl from Miletus, and there was a heated debate between aged father (cf. γέρον, 19) and degenerate son (the πόρθων of fr. 371): Caec. fr. 6 *garruli sine dentes iacent, sine nictentur perticis*, fr. 7 *sine suam senectutem ducat usque ad senium sorbilo*.

4643 was first transcribed by E. G. Turner in 1977. In 1998 C. F. L. Austin prepared a new version, and presented it for discussion (at the Cambridge Oxyrhynchus Seminar on 19 May 1998, to the xxii Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia in Florence on 24 August 1998 (*Atti* I (2001) 77–83, with plates), and in Urbino on 14 April 1999 (*QUCC* 63 (1999) 37–48, with plates); this provisional version appears as Men. fr. 361^a in *PCG* I p. 395). Subsequently R. A. Coles re-examined the original, and the final text printed here includes some modifications.

top

]. τὸνηττονε[
^υ
]α : παρμενω[
^{μς}
]. εικ : ουδελ[
]τροφιμετω[
 5]λακαιταβρ.[
]. ταις ικλ[

] [

] [

] . . . ςιε . ταν . [

] τωπραγμα[

] νδε . ηι : π[

 10] αμην[

] ττηνθυγατερ[

] δηγερωβ[

] . ν . ις . ερχουσαλι[

] επε . εφυσ[

 15] . δεπ[.] ηρομ[

] . [] χειρα[

] . [.] . [. . . .] νηρομ[

] . οιομαιτροπον . [

] . ειντωιγερο[

 20] εριεραζ[

] κατεμ . [

] αλε[

] υςιν[

1] ., lower left and upper right elements of circle, e.g. ο, ω τo, of ο only upper left quadrant (space too narrow for ω) ε[, or perhaps θ 2]α, only the sloping back ν[, only the top of the diagonal 3] ., traces of upright ;, represented by one point of ink near line-level below damage λ[, only the foot of an oblique rising to the right 5]λ, or λ (only the sloping back) .[, part of lower left of circle 6] ., end of top curve as of ε, c . ι, first, triangular top (λ, λ?), second triangular top, perhaps trace of cross-bar (λ) After 6, space for two lines, stripped and badly damaged, but enough surface survives to the right to suggest that there was no continuous text. Presumably χορογ stood here, centred; a possible oblique trace may represent the left-hand prong of γ 7] ., first, two small upright traces near to line-level ςιε, of c the top arc and lower part of the back, damage between (so that e.g. ε could also be considered) ε . τ, at line-level a small lower left-hand arc (or foot of upright hooked to the right?) 8]ρα, of ρ remains of an upright extending below the line; of λ the oblique back 9]ε . ηι, of ε scattered ink, dubious; then oblique traces suitable to λ or perhaps κ or η; of ι only a point at line-level (but no space for anything wider) 10], scattered ink; last perhaps oblique feet as of λ or sim. ν[, an upright and at the top remains of junction with an oblique descending from left to right 11]τη, remains of three uprights, compatible e.g. with τη or perhaps ρη 12], tops of two uprights?; then back and upper curves as of ο, or of c plus another letter; third perhaps foot of oblique descending to join upright (right-hand side of η? less likely ι with another letter preceding?) 13]ις doubtful εφυσ[, of c a left-hand arc, no cross-bar visible (ο possible?) 15]η, only the foot of an upright with gap to left, ι also possible? 16]χ, only the lower end of a down-sloping oblique α[, only the left-hand side and part of the cross-bar, η also possible? 17] .[, two low traces

18] , mid-part of oblique sloping down from left to right, mid-part of upright τ[, only a point on the edge, ?left-hand end of cross-bar just below the tops of letters 19] , perhaps foot of oblique descending from left to right (e.g. κ?) 21 ατ, of λ the top of an oblique sloping down to the right, possibly junction with another sloping down from right to left; of τ a long high horizontal, thicker towards the left (τ could be considered, π less likely) εμ. [, trace on the line 22]α, oblique back, λ also possible? ε[, elements of lower curve and cross-bar 23]υϛυ[RAC

1–6 Hymnis, Parmenon and his young master (τροφίμει 4) are talking about a party with drink (1?) and food (5).

1 π]ότον (or κρ]ότον) ἦτρον ε[.

2 The *nota personae* reads υ. . here, υ[in 9; in 3 we have [] . . , perhaps [υ]μς ([υμ]υς might suit the traces better, but seems long for the space).

Parmenon is a slave in *Samia*, *Theophrastumene*, *Plokion*, *Hypobolimaios* and elsewhere (add now **4642**).

4 τροφίμει. See the note on Men. fr. *140 (*PCG* vi ii p. 113).

5 e.g. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ βρώματα.

6–7 Below 6, space for two lines. The surface is largely stripped, but a patch of surface fibres survives to the right. That shows no sign of ink. If this area was blank, it presumably marked act-end, and χορογ will have been written in the centre; a small oblique trace to the left could belong to the left-hand oblique of γ.

8 οὔ]τω παραγμα[×

9 e.g. τή]νδ' ἐληι. (Υμν.) π[αί, Παρμένων.

11 τήν θυγατέρ[α: presumably the daughter of the old man in 19.

12 e.g. δῆ γ' ἐρῶ β[ραχεὶ λόγωι. For δῆ γε, see Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 247.

13 e.g. λέγουσ' ἀλ[κκομαι.

18]υ or]δ]ι, e.g. × - ~ νή] Δί' οἶομαι. At the end, τροπόν τ[ινά (Turner), as at *Asp.* 539, *Dysk.* 557, *Her.* 20, *Perik.* 158.

19 -]. εω τῶι γέρο[ντι - ~ -.

20 π]εριεργαζ[ι (ζ in the epigraphic form identified by Dr Gonis). For the verb cf. *Epith.* 575.

C. F. L. AUSTIN / P. J. PARSONS

4644. COMEDY (OR SATYR PLAY?)

69/5(a)

4.6 × 10.8 cm

First/second century
Plate IV

A scrap with remains of 8 lines and a 5.5 cm lower margin, written along the fibres (the back is blank). The hand is large, round and informal; horizontal elements often touch and sometimes ligature with the following letter. Notable letter-forms include the deep ε with cross-bar detached; η and π with the right-hand side heavily curved. Such a script might reasonably be assigned to the second century (compare e.g. V **841**, first hand, Pindar *Paeans* = *GLH* 14), but individual features are paralleled in the first century (*GLH* 10–11). Change of speaker is indicated by *dicola* set off by wide spacing (1?, 3 and 8), and perhaps by a simple space (5, but not 2 and 8?)

This scrap contains dialogue in (probably) iambic trimeters, with references to Piraeus and to Attica. Beyond that, interpretation will depend on the supplements. If we supply ἀρχ]ὸς θεῶν in 5, we are dealing with parody (Zeus secretly aboard a little boat in

ανθρω[with further ink above the λ. Dr Rea suggests, very plausibly, that the suprascript was ω (only the upper extremities now clearly visible): that is, a variant or correction ἄνθρω[πε.

6 οὔτ]ω, οὐπ]ω or ἴστ]ω. At the end perhaps λπ.

8 ἔνοι]κος or ὤς εἰ]κός? For εἴπερ, cf. Ar. *Nub.* 227 and (possibly) Men. *Mis.* 801. Between εἰ and περ blank space enough for one narrow letter, presumably accidental (we could divide e.g. ἄγροι]κος εἰ, so that περ. [begins another speech; but then the presumed dicolon must be taken as a damaged letter, something that the traces do not encourage).

C. F. L. AUSTIN / P. J. PARSONS

4645. NEW COMEDY

No inv. no.

14.5 × 11.3 cm

Late first/second century
Plate V

Remains of some 28 iambic lines in the style of New Comedy are given by parts of two columns preserved in poor condition in this fragment of a roll. The writing goes along the fibres; the back is blank. It is possible (not certain, because of the damage) that the lines are from the top of their columns, with a margin of 2 cm or more above; there is nothing to show how many lines each column once contained.

The script is a fluent small-sized hand of documentary character. An open appearance is given by the relatively wide spacing between lines and between columns. Cursive features are seen conspicuously in variant forms of ε, π and c, and in combinations of letters in ligature.

ε responds particularly flexibly to the sequence in which it is written: regularly made from down-curving base and upward-curving back, leading into a flat hook for top and mid-line horizontal, its base is sometimes written continuously with the last stroke of a preceding letter, and its horizontal may lead into a following letter, as in -μεν- ii 7, 10 (note the variant forms in επεχεῖ[c ii 8); there is also a more cursive form, as seen in ελλαδα i 1 and απερχομ' ii 11, with an open curve at the left, rising to a small loop and horizontal (this form can resemble a cursive κ as in μεικρ fr. 2.2); and there are some variant forms of ligature with ι, as in εχει i 2,]αρχεις i 3, δει i 4,]μεικρ. [fr. 2.2. ο is also variable: the left and right halves that form a small circle when well made (as in καλον ii 5) may devolve, when more rapidly written, into an oval or a narrow backward sloping ellipse (ελεεινος, αυος ii 4). π is sometimes formally written, with upright and flat top leading to a downward upright with a curved foot, as in ποιησαι ii 9 and απερχομ ii 11; it is also formed cursorily with a strong initial downstroke and a high rise-and-fall for the rest of the letter, as seen in κατελιπον i 7 and επεχεῖ[c ii 8. c is variable, like ε and π, and has analogies with both: it can be made as a descending curve with a curving or flat top added (ειc ii 5, -μενοccου ii 7); or with a short initial link stroke or foot, as sometimes in ε, and then a rising and falling curve (λεγειc i 8, αδελφης ii 7); or it may have an upright initial downstroke, like π, and then a rise-and-fall distinguished from π by its shorter fall, as in λ]εγειc i 5. ω appears twice, linked to letters either side of it (i 8) and with its right loop partly unwritten (ii 10).

Such features of the formation of letters, while not in themselves extraordinary, do add to the difficulty of reading in places where the written surface is damaged. In general, the handwriting gives an impression not of a professional scribe or of a novice, but of a practised writer making a rapid copy. One can wonder if the original owner of the roll was copying a favourite play for himself, or if he commissioned a personal secretary to write it out for him; it seems to lack the appeal expected of a text made for sale.

The dialogue is marked in the usual way by the dicolon, whether at mid-line or line-end; missing, as a result of damage at places where it would be expected, is the paragraphos that is regularly written under the beginning of verses in which or at the end of which the dialogue passes from one speaker to another; unexpected is a paragraphos at ii 5, for which see the notes. There are no accents. Apart from the dicolon, there is punctuation by high dot (i 8; ii 6 (thrice), 10, 12, 14); elision is marked by diastole (ii 5, 10, 11) — all this done at the time of making the copy, as the spacing shows, and not added; in ii 8 a word is left unelided at a change of speaker; in ii 11 elision before punctuation is unmarked. There is no sign of correction or annotation after copying, unless it is to be seen in some unexplained ink in the margin at i 1.

If this unpretentious specimen of a play-text is to be thought of as a private or privately-commissioned copy, we may wish to put it in the same general category as the London *Athenaion Politeia*, written on the back of accounts dated to AD 78–9 and assigned to the late first century; it resembles the Louvre Alcman, *Partheneia*, assigned to the same century, in some of its cursive features, but lacks the extensive lectional aids and annotations that that roll has; comparable in scale, but more upright, rounded and regular, is the comic fragment published as L 3540, again assigned to the first century, and with some (but notably fewer) cursive traits; the marked contrast, in any case, is with more formally calligraphic hands of the first century or the early second, in which period I incline to place the piece. (For L 3540, see Plate v in that volume; the other items referred to are in E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2nd edition by P. J. Parsons, BICS Suppl. 46, 1987): the *Ath. Pol.*, BL Pap. inv. 131, is no. 60, the *Partheneia*, Louvre E 3220, is no. 16; three formal hands of this period for contrast are nos. 37–9; to compare, dated documents of the Roman period in P. Ryl. II.)

Investigation of the content has not so far yielded a coincidence with any other text, or any other concrete evidence of identity. Since almost all the securely identified remains of copies of New Comedy are of plays by Menander, the chances that a new piece like this one comes from one of them are favourable; but unless more can be made out from it, the text to be discussed here must join the prospective addenda to the very valuable collection of unassigned fragments in vol. viii (1995) of the *Poetae Comici Graeci* by Rudolf Kassel and Colin Austin.

For a glimpse of the action of the piece, we depend on column ii. Someone is to be ‘put through his paces’ or ‘given a work out’ by the speaker, *γυμναστήος μοι*, line 4. Line 5 begins with a vocative, *Φαίδρ(ε)*. There seem to be three ways to interpret this. (a) Phaidros is a character present on stage (if so, line 4 should be an aside); (b) Phaidros is a character,

but not present (if so, this is a rehearsal for an approach to him that is intended to be made later on); and (c) Phaidros is not a character at all but a hypothetical person invented as part of the discourse. In view of what is to come, the last possibility seems to me the likeliest. Phaidros, who on any account seems to be wealthy, is told in ironical and emotive language how lucky it is that he has on hand a man ‘pitiable, ruined, crippled’, someone connected with his sister — as it might be, her husband, *ὁ νυ[μφίος]*; but that is conjecture. If (a) or (b) were true, one would expect this powerful lead to be developed. Instead, there is something new. Line 8: someone present is addressed in the second person, and responds. It seems that we have a question ‘Are you patriotic?’, ‘Are you a Good Citizen?’; to which the expected answer (though hard to read) surely amounts to ‘Yes’. Then (line 9), the first speaker declares that his response to an action by the Good Citizen (we have to guess what) is to be destructive and fill the place with shouting. After that, we have only fragments of the sense: ‘you will be persuaded’(?), ‘you understand’, ‘I go away’, ‘you take my point’.

The fragment was briefly examined and identified as New Comedy by Sir Eric Turner. I am very grateful to the Egypt Exploration Society for permission to incorporate an earlier version of this presentation in a paper in honour of Olivier Reverdin (*Mélanges Reverdin*, ed. J.-P. Cottier, Geneva 2000), as well as to Dr Neil Hopkinson for proof-reading a print-out of that paper and helping me to clarify several points. The present publication has had the further advantage of a fresh and close scrutiny of the fragment by Dr Revel Coles (RAC) and is different in a number of places where I have been led to qualify or give up some of my more optimistic assumptions.

Col. i

	Top (?)		
]νελλαδα] . [τῆ]ν Ἑλλάδα
]γεχει :]ν ἔχει:
] . ρχειβιον]αρχεις βίον
]ησαθροαδει		-]ης ἀθρόα δει
5] . γεις :		λ]έγει:
] . νεστιαν] . ν ἔστιαν
]ανκατελιπον]αν κατέλιπον
] . ωκληγεις·] . ως λέγει·
] . εστινειπεμοι]ς ἔστιν, εἰπέ μοι,
10] . [] . [. .] . .]νιαι:		-]νίας:
]ς		
]		
]ς :		

μεικρ. [. . .]
 . . . τα [. . .]
 . . .] . [. . .]

5 ν . . . , traces of two verticals and a link stroke, a sloping stroke or narrow loop, and a vertical can be taken as π α ρ τ ι . , vertical, e.g. first of ν ν . [, point level with letter-tops, damage below 6 c e ν or c a ν RAC; first read as c υ μ - in ligature 7] . [, slightly displaced downwards, traces of a horizontal and of a letter with a curved base, as for] ρ ε [α . [, α given by the tip of two narrowly diverging diagonals or a narrow loop on the line; then the foot of a sloping upright and a low dot of ink: α λ λ (as in ε λ λ α δ α ι ι) ? or α λ λ 8 . [. .] , trace of the top of a tall vertical, as in the φ of 5] ρ . , confused ink on torn fibres τ α , feet of two uprights, the first sloping with a speck of ink to its left, whence probably τ ι ; then traces consistent with μ α λ ι c τ α , i.e. low curve for first of μ ; doubtfully, α λ ι in ligature; then trace of curve for c . . . [, first, ends of rising diagonal; last, end of long descender, e.g. ι of ε ι in ligature, as in 6 9 β α λ reasonably clear from characteristic lower parts of these letters; then traces consistent with ο ν τ α 10 κ α κ , κ looks a tight fit, but the fibres are torn and displaced in a way that also affects the beginning of ρ , where α ε ι seems acceptable π ε . , see comm. η . [, backward-sloping stroke with a downward stroke from its top, c suggested 11] ν . . , possibly] η ο c 12 μ [, foot of sloping upright and base of curve suggest μ not ν 13 Slight space after] . . . c , but apparent diastole is probably just a stain

Fr. 2: 2] , triangular ink, i.e. α 3] . [, ink below κ ρ of 2, perhaps interlinear: . . τ α ?

(A) μ . . α . . . τ . ν ε ρ . . ε σ τ ι τ ᾶ λ λ [λ α
 γ υ μ ν α σ τ ῆ ο c μ ο ι κ . . . ρ ο c . . . [. . .]
 5 “ Φ α ἰ δ ρ ’ , εἰς καλὸν πᾶρεστι . . . ὁ ν υ [μ φ ῖ ο c — (?)
 ἐ λ ε ξ ἰ ν ὸ c α ὐ ο c π η ρ ὸ c , εἰ c e ν . [. . .]
 ὁ] γ ε [ν ὸ] μ ε ν ὸ c ο υ τ ῆ c ἀ δ ε λ φ ῆ c . ” ἀ λ λ [ᾶ τ ῖ ;
 φ [ι λ] ὀ π ο λ ι c εἰ ; (B) τ ῖ ; μ ᾶ λ ι c τ ’ (A) ἐ π ἔ χ ε ι [c τ ι . π ᾶ ν τ α μ ε (?)
 δ εἰ κατ [α] β α λ ὸ ν τ α μ ε σ τ ᾶ π ο ι ῆ c αἰ β ο ῆ c .
 10 κ ᾶ κ ’ ἄ ν π ε ὶ ὠ μ ε ν , εἶ c τ ι π ε ι c θ η c [.] ι . ν ο εἰ [c ; (?)
 - ο ν τ ’ ἀ π ἔ ρ χ ο μ ’ , ἄ ν π [-
 -] . . μ α ν θ ᾶ ν εἰ c γ ε . (B) μ [-

3 (A) . . . is [(?) the rest] . . .
 I have to give a work-out to [(?) . . .]
 5 ‘Phaidros, happily, you have on hand [. . .] the [(?) husband]
 — pitiable, ruined, crippled, [.] —
 as he now is, of your sister.’ [(?) But what of that?]
 Are you patriotic? (B) What? Very much so. (A) You propose [(?) something: the whole place,]
 in knocking (it) down, I must fill with shouting.
 10 If we . . . harm, it is possible . . . persuaded. You follow me?
 [. . .] I go away if [. . .]
 [. . .] you take my point, don’t you? (B) [. . .]

4 *γυμναστέος* is used literally of training athletes by Philostratus, *de gymnastica*, e.g. §29 (p. 156.11 Jüthner) *γυμναστέοι δ' ὄμως, μᾶλλον δὲ κολακευτέοι τῶ γυμνάζοντι*. Here it has the metaphorical sense of 'wear out, harass', as can the verb *γυμνάζω* (LSJ s.v. II — so in Menander, *Achaioi*, fr. 8.9 K.-A., of Fortune giving a poor and humble man a hard time); it is to be added to lexica in that sense.

κ . . . ρος . . . [: my original suggestion *κληρονόμος* is excluded by the apparent *ς* after *ρος*, and the search for a subject for the sentence is open; that may have stood at the end of 3. *καὶ πρὸς* (offered as a 'best guess' by RAC) would lead one to think of a construction for the end of the line parallel to *γυμναστέος*.

5 Phaidros is not attested as a character-name in Comedy, but (as Colin Austin remarks to me) it is the title of a play by Alexis and could have belonged to a character there: *PCG* II 159–61; Arnott, *Commentary* 691–4. As taken here it is the name of a hypothetical rich man, and not of one of the *dramatis personae*.

The paragraphos now noted under *Φαῖδρος(ε)* is puzzling; there is no other indication of a change of speaker either from double points in the text (though they may have been lost by damage) or from the words surviving. The 'work-out' of *γυμναστέος μοι* must be the reference in 5–7 to someone connected with the victim's sister: to make sense, it needs to include, and not to be interrupted by, the powerful words *ἐλεεινὸς αἴδος πηρός κτλ.* in 6. The damaged letters after mid-line in 5 could in theory represent an interjection (say, *πῶς*), but there is no sign that they did. The stop-gap *ρῆν* which was my original suggestion is not to be trusted as a reading, and I have left the place blank. Line 8, also apparently beginning with *φ*, does need a paragraphos (we cannot tell if it had one) and might have been the source of confusion. (In papyri of Homer, direct speeches within the poet's narrative are sometimes marked off by paragraphoi. I owe to Cavallo and Maehler, *Greek Bookhands* 6a, an example in which the paragraphos is put under the first line of a speech, and not the last of the preceding narrative, namely *βάσκι' ἴθι, Ἴρι ταχεῖα* at *Il.* II.186 in P. Reinach II 69. I am very grateful to Martin West for a generous selection of references which show that this is an anomaly, and not an effective parallel to the case under discussion.)

εἰς καλὸν 'fortunately, opportunely' is normal in contexts of people arriving, as at M. *Samia* 280, where Austin's note gives examples, including *εἰς καλὸν ἦκει* 'it's good you're here' at Plato, *Symp.* 174e. *παρεῖναι* here, as at M. *Dysk.* 717 and elsewhere, presumably implies 'close at hand' rather than referring precisely to physical presence or (as it might if the situation were differently conceived) to a stage movement.

At the end, several different restorations are possible: *ον* itself is highly ambiguous (it could be *ὁ ν-* or *ὄν*, or the beginning of a proper name *Ἰον-* or *ὁ Ν-*), and the following trace is minimal ink level with the letter tops. *ὁ νυ[μφίος]* is one guess. But if (say) *ὁ νύ[ν παρών]* or anything else unconnected with *τῆς ἀδελφῆς* in 7 is adopted, a word will be needed in that line to go with the genitive: see below.

6 'Pitiable, ruined, crippled': the string of unconnected adjectives, marked by the triple stop, gives an enhanced pathetic effect, perhaps recognizably overdone, as in Aristophanes' description of the Euripidean Telephus as *χωλὸς προσαιτῶν τρωμύλος δεινὸς λέγειν* at *Ach.* 429 (cf. 451 f., *νῦν δὲ γενεὸν γλίχχος προσαιτῶν λιπαρῶν*).

αἴδος, lit. 'dry', is found in Menander in the sense of 'drained dry by fear' (*Ephr.* 901: LSJ s.v. 6), but in this context seems to anticipate a usage known from Lucian and elsewhere in the sense 'drained dry of money' ('stony broke' LSJ s.v. 7, citing, *inter alia*, *Toxaris* 16); at Alciphron 3.34 we have *ἐγὼ δὲ αἴδος ὦν ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδείας* of a parasite shrivelled by hunger.

πηρός seems to fit the sense, but there is ink at the lower level which *π* does not explain. *ξηρός* (J. R. Rea) could be considered as a reading: what would it mean in juxtaposition with *αἴδος*?

The end of the line is obscure, given *εἰεν[* or *εἰαν[* for the *εἰενυ-* that was my original reading; also a scrap of papyrus with traces of two letters has been unjustifiably mounted at this point. *εἷς <ς> ἐναντίος* would complete the sense, but the data are too ambiguous for serious conjecture.

7 See above on 5: unless *κοῦ τῆς ἀδελφῆς* depends on a word there, it must be taken to depend on a word (probably beginning *ἀλλ-* or *ἀν-*) at the end of this line; it is not clear if there was punctuation after *ἀδελφῆς* or not. For the word-order, see Kühner–Gerth, *Gr. Gramm.* I 619 under 4.

ἀλλὰ τί (rather like 'So what?') dismissing the point in favour of a stronger one: as, for instance, at M. *Samia* 348 (end of line, as here), and (continuing) at 593 *ἀλλὰ τί | τοῦτο πρὸς ἐκείν' ἐστί*; The speaker turns from the case of the wealthy man to one which engages his interlocutor directly, that of the good citizen.

8 τί; μάλιςτ', taking for granted that he is a Good Citizen, rather than τί μάλιςτα; 'What precisely do you mean?', as in Plato: LSJ s.v. μάλα, to which Colin Austin refers me.

8-9 ἐπέχει[ς τ], if rightly read, must refer to something which the speaker proposes to knock down by shouting: i.e. a positive proposal or an offer made publicly in an assembly, where barracking was a notorious method of obstruction: βοᾶν ὑποκρούειν λοιδορεῖν τοὺς ῥήτορας, as Aristophanes puts it (*Ach.* 38). 'You propose something' (or whatever the word was) is itself to be taken as a proposition, not a statement: i.e. 'If (or *When*) you propose something, *then* I must . . .' — a kind of parataxis that is quite common in comedy, and recurs in passages of self-description, like that of the parasite at *M. Dysk.* 57-68 and the cook at 493-7 (see my *Dyskolos of Menander* ad locc.). The end requires a noun or its equivalent to go with μεστά; for πάντα 'the whole scene', perhaps compare *Ar. Kn.* 99f. πάντα ταυτὶ καταπάω βουλευμάτων 'I'll spatter the whole place with bright ideas.'

10 Originally I reconstructed this as κάκ' ἂν προῶμεν, ἔστι πεισθῆν[α]ι; 'If we do harm, it is possible to be persuaded'. Here προῶμεν would be better taken as referring ambitiously to the speaker and people like himself than divided, somewhat artificially, as ποῶ μέν: Kühner-Gerth, *Gr. Gramm.* 1 83f.; πεισθῆν[α]ι should be in the sense of πεισθῆναι χρήμασι 'bribed' (*Thuc.* 1.137.2; LSJ s.v. A.ii.2). However, closer scrutiny by RAC concludes that πρ. ὠμεν was written, and then πεισθη[ς] ι. πέρωμεν gives a Greek word, and that (or πέρωμεν) could be read, but I do not then see how to make coherent sense; πάθωμεν can be thought of, but not verified. If the stop after ι] is secure, πεισθῆς[ε]ι seems to be suggested; before it, Herwig Maehler proposes ε(ι)ς τι.

11-12 One might guess from μανθάνεις γε in 12 that the passage continued in a similar vein: in 11f. ἀπέρχομ' ἂν π[άθω | [ἀγαθόν τι . . .], or something similar, can be thought of. At the end of 12, the trace suggests μ[, as for μ[ή] or another monosyllable, and not ν[for ν[αί].

13-15 The scrap, fr. 2, had been placed so that the traces in line 1 joined those at the end of 13 to give]υσηντι[(then ἦδ]υς ἦν τ[ις 'he was easy-going' is a possible conjecture); fr. 2.2]μεικρ. [would contribute some letters from the end of 14. But the placing is very uncertain; without it read]υτηντι[in 13, which points to a line ending with α]ύτην or τα]ύτην and part of τις.

Fr. 2.2]μεικρ. [: last letter apparently triangular (α?), not ε]μ[ε]ικρ[ι]ν-.

3 Superscript letters might be read as a *nota personae*: RAC suggests Γ'έτα[ς]. Unfortunately nothing shows what part (if any) a Getas played in the scene examined so far.

E. W. HANDLEY

4646. NEW COMEDY

A 14/4

fr. 1 4.3 × 13.5 cm

Second century
Plate VII

These three scraps come from what was once a handsome papyrus roll of medium size containing a copy of a play of New Comedy. New Comedy is readily recognizable from style and content in the beginnings of iambic trimeters presented by fr. 1; frs. 2 and 3 may join to give an approximate original height. On the back, across the vertical fibres, the other way up from this side, are remains of lines (apparently a literary or subliterary text) written in a straggly semi-cursive hand assignable to the third century and later rather than earlier.

There is room for caution over the dating of these hands, not least because of the small extent of the specimens. The comic text is in a formal, medium-to-large sized round hand of the type known as Roman Uncial (*G. Cavallo, ASNP*, ser. II, 36 (1967) 209-20; Sir Eric Turner's reservations about the use of this (as of some other) names for styles of script

are well known: *GMAW*² Introd., and in particular p. 38 n. 1). This calligraphic style, the generous upper and lower margins, and the presence of carefully written lectional aids all speak of a professionally made copy of a well-known play. There is a marked tendency to serifs at the ends of strokes, horizontal and diagonal as well as vertical (ρ is especially notable). Possible comparisons are the Hesiod of XXIII 2354, and the Choral Lyric of XXXII 2624, the latter with Latin cursive on the back as well as some Greek (E. A. Lowe, *CLA* suppl. 1791). Both of these are assigned to the first half of the second century, and the back of 2624 to the second half. The editors quote further parallels; a recently published comic fragment in the same style is LIX 3972, which was tentatively assigned to the mid to late second century by me. If 4646 recto is to be dated similarly, and the dating suggested for the verso is correct, there must have been a substantial interval before the roll was turned over and reused.

The spacing of the line-beginnings on the back of fr. 1 does not match that of the line-ends on fr. 2+3, so that two different columns must be represented; there is nothing to show whether they were adjacent or not, or in what order they came. On the front, fr. 1 at lines 6–8 has recognizable content in the shape of a formula of betrothal: the parallels that verify this also show that there is more than one way in which the lines may have read, so that restoration is necessarily *exempli gratia*. What little is left of lines 1–5 may suggest that there was some discussion of the suitability of the match (4 ἔθει, φύς[ει . . . ‘by character and nature . . .’; 5 τί οὖν ἀηδ[έε . . . or the like ‘What’s wrong then . . .?’). What follows the betrothal, very swiftly, is a parting (12 ἔ]ρωωω . . .); then in 14–16 teasing references to forethought (π]ρόνοια), insomnia (ἀ]γρυπνῶ or a related word), and what seems to be the expression of a wish (γ]ένοιτο). ‘Teasing’ in the sense that perhaps the betrothal was one in which all was not as well as it might seem: for (a) the dowry mentioned may have been somewhat unusual (see the discussion of 6–8); and (b) sleeplessness, as we know from the beginning of Menander’s *Misoumenos* and its commentators, if not otherwise, is characteristic of an unhappy lover rather than a fulfilled one (or did he perhaps say ‘[No longer] am I sleepless’?). It is in any case to be noted that in formulaic situations like this, Menander sometimes seems more concerned to move the action on than to develop details, which therefore should not be pressed too hard: see on this my note in *Dyskolos of Menander* on 841. The other column (fr. 2+3, line 1) contributes (or seems to do) πρ]εβεία. A possible context for the mention of a privilege of seniority, as the plot of Menander’s *Aspis* suggests, is a conflict of interests between brothers in one of the legal situations in which seniority is allowed to count: in *Aspis*, Smikrines asserts it over his younger brother Chairestratos with the intention of enforcing his right to marry their deceased brother’s daughter and so win control of her inheritance. (He is, of course, frustrated.) One can only wait and see whether any further discoveries will make it possible to say what function the mention of πρεβεία had in the comedy to which these scraps belonged.

This text, and the lines on the back, were briefly presented and discussed by me at the XIth International Congress of Classical Studies in Kavala, in a paper read on 26 August 1999 with the title ‘A double bill: two dramatic texts from an Oxyrhynchus papyrus’. I am

very grateful to the Egypt Exploration Society for permission to do that, as well as to Professor Christina Dedoussi and the other organizers of the Congress for their invitation and kind hospitality.

fr. 1

	top	
	δεινονγε[δεινον γε[
	εις, ηνμ.[
	διαυτοτ[δι' αὐτὸ τ[οὔτ(ο)
	εθει·φν.[ἔθει· φνζ[-
5	τιουναηδ[τί οὖν ἀηδ[
	παιδωνε[παίδων ἐ[π' ἀρότῳ
	διδωμιτ[δίδωμι τ[
	προιξήμ[προιξήμ[ι-
	κατατασδ[κατὰ τὰς δ[-
10	γωπαθω[ἐγὼ παθω[
]γαπωνθ[ἀ]γαπῶν θ[
]ρρωσο·τᾶ[ἔ]ρρωσο· τᾶ[λλα
]μενβ[
]ρονοια·δ[π]ρόνοια· δ[
15]γρυπνω.[ἀ]γρυπνῶ.[
]ενοιτ[γ]ένοιτ[ο
]...[
	.	

2 .η, ink just before left-hand tip of the following η will belong to a serif/hook on it, and further horizontal traces to the left, suitable to top of Γ or τ 4 .[, left-hand half of round letter 5 ουν on broken fibres, first read by W. E. H. Cockle δ[, left-hand end of horizontal at line-level, joined a little to the right by an oblique descending from right to left 10 end of paragraphos noted by Cockle; at the end left-hand arc of ω or ο 15 .[, point of ink level with tops of letters

1 E.g. δεινὸν γέ[ροντι or γε[νέσθαι, beginning a gnomic line, or δεινὸν γε.

4 φύς[ει suits the trace. The stop need not imply a strong pause; it may simply be there to mark out elements in an asyndeton: ἔθει, φύς[ει; if that is so, probably with a parallel word preceding or following: cf. above **4645** ii 6, and (in a context of marriage), M. *Dysk.* 65f. πυνθάνομαι γένος, βίον, τρόπους.

5 Most likely ἀηδ[έε, asking what objection can be raised to the marriage under discussion; the line will have contained the reply οὐδὲ ἔν or something similar before the betrothal formula begins.

6–8 The words παίδων, δίδωμι and προιξ show that we have here a formula of betrothal. The paragraphos under 7 implies that the prospective bridegroom accepts before the dowry is mentioned, as Polemon does at *Perik.* 436/1014. Here, as there, λαμβάνω can be assumed to have stood at line end; Sandbach (ad loc.) gives examples of the formula and its variations in word order. Both γνησίων παίδων ἐπ' ἀρότῳ and παίδων ἐπ' ἀρότῳ γνησίων

occur; either could have stood here; and the rest of the expected content will likewise fit in in more than one way. As to dowries and their sizes, commentators on Menander (for instance Handley on *Dysk.* 842–4 and Sandbach on *Epitr.* 8/134) give examples and select references to the extensive modern bibliography. If ἡμ[- (note the breathing) is taken to indicate ἡμ[ιτάλαντον, as it seems likely to do, it will hardly be enough, by the standards known from Comedy, to be the whole amount: it should specify a sum of money to be augmented by real estate and/or other valuables. A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* 1 (1968) 2–9 and 48–50, quotes some texts which show that dowries could be composite in this way, and makes it clear that, in different circumstances, the procedure from preliminary contract to marital union could go in stages. So, in XXXI 2533 (Kassel–Austin, *PCG* VIII 1098), the young man is told τὴν προῖκα δ’ αὐτὸς οἶσθα, ‘the dowry you already know’, after the betrothal formula has been pronounced, and before hearing what supplementary benefits are in store for him. Against this background, though it would be rash to claim any verbal authority for a restoration, the drift of what is happening is hardly in doubt, and one way it could have been expressed is as follows:

5 : τοιγαροῦν]
 6 παίδων ξ[π’ ἀρότω γενεῶν σοι, (proper name?)
 7 δίδωμι τ[τὴν ἐμὴν θυγατέρα : λαμβάνω :
 8 προῖξ ἡμ[ιτάλαντον ἀργύρου, καὶ τᾶλλα πρόσ,
 9 κατὰ τὰς δεδομένους ἐγγύας . . .

6 might end with *Μοσχίων*, *Χαιρεφών* or another man’s name suitable to the metre; in 7 *θυγατέρα* or perhaps *ἀδελφήν*; see below on fr. 2+3.1. There is no sign of a paragraphos for change of speaker until 10, though damage and abrasion may be responsible for that; the *mot juste* for a reply, wherever it came, is *δέχομαι*, as at *Dysk.* 748.

11 ἀ]γαπῶν θ[- (or θ’) or -ώνθ’.

12 τᾶ]λλα (the accent marking the crasis) seems more probable here than ταῦτα, τᾶνδον or whatever.

13 E. g. δ] μὲν β[ίος, among several possibilities, such as ἀ] μὲν β[εβούλευμαι γάρ

15 ἀγρυπνῶ, -νῶν; or, as Marcello Gigante remarked to me, ἀγρυπνῶ or -νωί. It could in any case have been preceded by a negative at the end of 14.

fr. 2+3

]. cβ€[
]ωτοτ[πρ]ε cβ€[ῖα
]αιτω[-]ω τότ[ε
] . χη[-]αί τιν[α
5] . . [
] . [
] . [
] . . [
] [
10] . [
] [
] . [
] [
] [

15] [

]...[

] [

] [

] [

] [

20]βιοϑ[

] [

] [

] [

]. [

. . .

fr. 2 = 1-12, fr. 3 = 12-24 (the join is quite uncertain). 5-11, 13-19, 21-4 show few traces of ink, in some or most cases because of stripping (but some of the blank surface may represent lines ending short).

1], traces of mid-line horizontal with ink above 4], top of round letter 12], two traces, taken as parts of one letter shared between the joined fragments, might match the join on the verso, but give scant support to it (in any case, some of the ink showing may belong to the verso text) 24], this ink may belong to the verso text

1 πρ]εϑβε[ία suits the first trace and the accent bridging two vowels. A following monosyllable or a disyllable with elision would give a line-ending, and that would suit τότε 2 and τῶα 3; it is possible to think of the second metron, with τότ' and τῶ' in elision, but not of the first.

For πρεϑεία, see particularly Harrison (quoted above) 131 n. 4 and 152; Douglas M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* 92, 95 with n. 208, referring to Menander, *Aspis* 141-3, 185-7, 254-5; Sandbach on *Aspis* 164 (p. 76), 184, 187. Without context, there is no way to tell what is implied for the plot of the play by the appearance of this word: it may imply that (as in *Aspis*) there was a situation in which one brother asserted his right of seniority over another; but it is in any case prudent to allow that the person betrothing the girl may in fact be her brother (for all we can tell) and not her father as so often.

E. W. HANDLEY

b. PROSE

4647. ENCOMIUM OF THE HORSE

66 6B.1/F(1-3)b

fr. 1 7.3 × 4.5 cm

Second/third century
Plate V

On the back of three fragments of an official letter or report are remains of two columns of a prose text, upside down in relation to the recto text. Under the second column, of which only part of the last line survives, is the end-title in large, careful letters and framed by small diagonal strokes.

The documentary text on the recto, written by two different hands, does not help to establish the distance between the fragments; fr. 2 preserves the top margin on the recto side (and the bottom margin of the verso); fr. 3 belongs to the right of fr. 1 (both are in the same hand) because it preserves the ends of lines, but their position relative to each other cannot be determined.

On the verso, a narrow strip of the vertical fibres has been lost, running through from fr. 1.6 to fr. 2.8; after the line-ends of fr. 2 there is a blank space 4 cm wide. Some offsets can be discerned here.

The hand is small, somewhat cramped and irregular; it leans slightly to the right. Apart from *αι*, there are few ligatures. No accents or breathings; punctuation only once (fr. 1.5); apostrophe in fr. 1.4–5 *ελατ'τον*; some corrections and additions above the line, by the same hand. The orthography is poor (*ε* for *αι* fr. 1.3, *ι* for *ει* fr. 1.3, fr. 2.2, 4, 8; *ω* for *ο* perhaps fr. 1.8); iota adscript is not written at the only place that requires it (fr. 2.10 *αυτω*).

Composing praises (*ἐγκώμια*) of persons and all kinds of objects was an important part of rhetorical training; many of the extant ‘introductions’ to rhetoric (*προγυμνάσματα*) contain a ‘definition of praise’ (*ὄρος ἐγκωμίου*), e.g. Theon (*Rhetores graeci* II 109–12 Spengel = pp. 74–8 Patillon–Bolognesi), Aphthonius (II 35–6 Sp.), Nikolaos Sophistes (III 477 Sp.). Among the objects of praise, Aphthonius mentions *ἄλογα ζῶα, ὡς ἵππον ἢ βοῦν*. Strangely, no *ἐγκώμιον ἵππου* has been preserved among the *progymnasmata* of the known orators, although an *ἐγκώμιον βοός* is found in the *Progymnasmata* of Libanius (VIII 267–73 Foerster) and of Nikolaos (*Rhetores graeci* I 332–3 Walz). The piece by Libanius does contain a comparison (*σύγκρισις*) of the qualities of ox and horse (§§ 10–13, pp. 271–2 Foerster), which claims that the ox is in many ways more useful than the horse. Our papyrus text is the first direct example of a rhetorical *ἐγκώμιον ἵππου* in prose. In a general way, our author seems to follow the advice of Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata* 40 (p. 17 Rabe) concerning praises of animals (*ἄλογα ζῶα*): *ἐρεῖς τίνι θεῶν ἀνάκειται, οἶον . . . ὁ ἵππος τῷ Ποσειδῶνι ὁμοίως δὲ ἐρεῖς πῶς τρέφεται, ποταπὸν τὴν ψυχὴν, ποταπὸν τὸ σῶμα, τίνα ἔργα ἔχει, ποῦ χρήσιμα κτλ.* (Latin version in Priscian, *Praeexercitamina* 7 = *Opuscula* I, ed. Marina Passalacqua, Roma 1987, pp. 42–4). But the name of the author does not appear in the end-title; that too suggests that this piece, hastily written and badly spelled on reused papyrus, represents an autograph exercise, not a substantive text.

	col. i		col. ii
Fr. 1		Fr. 3	
↓	<p> . . . [] ο . . . [] . . .] ε ν α ι ε ν α φ θ ν ο ι κ δ ε δ ι ε τ ω μ ε ν ο ν π λ ο υ τ ο υ δ ο κ ι α γ λ α ι σ μ α [δ .] ν α ι ο υ κ ε λ α τ ' </p>		<p> . . . [] . [] [] μ ε ω σ α . . . α . [] ' ' [] ' ' ' </p>

	col. i		col. ii
fr. 1		fr. 3	
↓	<p> ..[]ο..[]]έναι ἐν ἀφθόνοις δὲ δι- ετώμενον πλούτου δοκ(ε)ῖ ἀγλαΐσμα ^{εἶ}[[δ.]ναι οὐκ ἔλατ- 5 τον· οἶος μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἵππ[.. ων ευθυς[.]νεταὶ καὶ τ[νημα αυ[...]....[.]ιτῶ[.. ὀχρήματι []..[ἐπιβλεπ[...]....επα.[10 ..]ων παραδόξων κα[ἰ ..]ων ..]των μεταλαμβάν(ε)ι [..].[...].δ.[...].ε[...]....κι[..].[...].δ.[...].ε[...]....κι[</p>	<p> ..[] []..μewc α...α .[] ' '[]''']ΠΠΟΥ' ΕΓ]ΚΩΜΙΟΝ ' , </p>	
fr. 2	<p> ]...ην]α[]..[...].ραπίας καὶ .]ιμα[...].ον ο[.]αν πομπὰς 5 κοσμ[...]. καὶ πανηγ[ύ]ρ(ε)ις· ἵπ- πος δ[ἐ] ἀνθρώποις καὶ κυ- τρατεύεται καὶ κυνοπλί- ζετα[ι π]ρομετωπιδίοις μὲν [ὄς]ον κράν(ε)ι, προ{ς}- 10 στερνίδια δὲ καὶ παρα- μηρίδια ὅσα θώραξ αὐτῶ κάλυμμα τοῦ σώματος </p>		

Fr.1

² ἐν ἀφθόνοις δὲ seems to imply a contrast: between poor people and 'wealthy people'? or between the cost of buying the horse and the cost of keeping it 'in lavish conditions'?

2–3 read *δαιτώμενον* (sc. ζῶον?). Plu. *Agis et Cleom.* 55.3 . . . τὸν ἄπιν ἐν ἀφθόνοις δαιτώμενον καὶ τρυφᾶν δοκοῦντα . . .

3 *δοκ(ε)ῖ*: ‘but when this (creature?) lives in plenty (or: among wealthy people?), it seems no less an adornment of wealth’.

5–6 *οἶος μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἵππ[ε]ύων* may imply a correlative *τοῖος* or the like with reference to *ὀχήματι*: ‘just as the rider . . . (keeps it) as a means of transport, (so the charioteer uses it yoked to his) chariot’?

6 *εὐθὺς* (adjective or adverb?) or *εὐθὺς* *ς*? The gap would hold two letters, or three narrow ones. No convincing supplement has occurred to me; *εὐθὺς* *τρεῖνεται* ‘the rider stretches himself straight’ does not seem to make sense, and Hesych. *καίνεται κινεῖται, καλεύεται, ταραττεται* can hardly be relevant here, as it seems to refer to Paul 1 *Thess.* 3.3 τὸ μηδένα καίνεσθαι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι ταύταις. Could it mean ‘he is being flattered’? Cf. Polyb. 16.24.6 (Philip) *Μυλαεῖς καὶ Ἀλαβανδεῖς καὶ Μάγνητες, οὐς ὅποτε μὲν τι δοῖεν, ἔστανεν, ὅτε δὲ μὴ δοῖεν, ὑλάκτει*. One might suspect that the author had A. *Cho.* 192–3 in mind: *εἶναι τὸδ’ ἀγλαίεμά μοι τοῦ φιλάτου / βροτῶν Ὀρέστου — καίνομαι δ’ ὑπ’ ἐλπίδος*.

6–7 *τ[έ]χ[ν]ημα* ‘device, contrivance’? Perhaps 6–8 *τ[έ]χ[ν]ημα αὐ[τὸν ζεύγνυς] ι τῶ[ι?] ὀχήματι* ‘and yokes him as a device to the wagon’? But there are difficulties. *τῶ[ι]* makes a short line, even with the iota adscript (which is not written in fr. 2.10); the papyrus seemingly has *ωχηματι*, which must then be taken as a misspelling.

9 *ἐπιβλεπ[τ]* could refer either to the horse or (if *ἵππ[ε]ύων* in 5–6 is right) to the rider; i.e. everybody looks at him as he rides by. The space and the traces would allow *ἐπιβλεπ[το]ς δὲ πάς[ι]ν*. Dr Coles, on a re-examination, thinks that the ink before **18** best suits **ρ**, and suggests *π[ε]ρίβλεπ[το]ς* instead.

10–11 *πα[ρ]αδόξων κα[ὶ] θαν | μας^{εργ}τῶν με[τ]αλαμβάν(ε)ι*, ‘it takes part in amazing and wonderful exploits’? (But *μας* looks a letter too long for the space.) Although this could also refer to the rider (*ἵππ[ε]ύων*, 5–6), the horse may be a likelier subject in view of what is said about it in fr. 2.

Fr. 2

2 Perhaps *θε[ρ]απ(ε)ῖας* ‘care’; cf. Plato *Euthyphr.* 13a *ἵππους οὐ πάς ἐπίσταται θεραπεύειν ἀλλὰ ὁ ἵππικός*.

3–4 *τ[ι]μᾶ [αὐτ]ὸν ὄ[τ]αν πομπὰς κοσμ[ῆ]* ‘he (= the horseman?) honours it when it adorns processions’.

6–8 *κυνοπλῖζετ[αι] π[ρο]μετωπίδιοις μὲν [ἄ]ρον κράν(ε)ι*: the horse is equipped with front-pieces ‘as with a helmet’.

7 *π[ρο]μετωπίδιοις*: I take this to be an instrumental dative with *κυνοπλῖζετ[αι]*. For Xenophon, front-pieces were part of the standard equipment of a cavalry horse: *Eq.* 12.8 *ὀπλίζεω δεῖ καὶ τὸν ἵππον προμετωπίδιω καὶ προστερνιδίω καὶ παραμηριδίω, Cyr.* 6.4.1 *ὁ δ’ ἄλλος στρατός . . . ἐξωπλίζετο πολλοῖς μὲν καὶ καλοῖς χιτῶσι, πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ καλοῖς θώρασι καὶ κράνεσιν· ὀπλίζον δὲ καὶ ἵππους προμετωπίδιοις καὶ προστερνιδίοις· καὶ τοὺς μὲν μονίππους παραμηριδίω, τοὺς δ’ ὑπὸ τοῖς ἄρμασιν ὄντας παραπλευριδίω*; cf. also Xen. *Cyr.* 7.1.2 and *Anab.* 1 8.6; Iamblichus fr. 1; Arrian *Tact.* 4.1.

8–10 *προ[σ]τερνίδια δὲ καὶ παραμηρίδια ὄσα θώραξ*: breast-covers and thigh-armour cover the horse’s body ‘like a corselet’; the verb at the end of this sentence may have been *ἐστίν*, or *παρέχει* if *κάλυμμα* is accusative.

Fr. 3

2–3 There is space for one line between 2 and the ornamental border above the title. There is no way to tell whether the text ended with 2 or continued into a short (not more than c.10 letters) third line. However, to the right of fr. 1.3 there is isolated ink on the broken edge, suggesting the lower left angle of a flattened Δ . Dr Coles suggests that this is the beginning of a hooked paragraphos, $\underline{\hspace{1cm}}$, which marked the end of the text in col. ii. In that case, line 3 would have been blank apart from the extending horizontal of the paragraphos.

H. MAEHLER

4648. PROSE ON STAR-SIGNS QUOTING HOMER, HESIOD, AND OTHERS

30 4B.35/F(1-3)a

9.5 × 22 cm

Third century
Plate VI

Top and thirty-three lines of a column of prose on the science of astronomy written in an informal hand on the back a much-rubbed third-century petition to a prefect of Egypt (whether a loose sheet or a piece cut from a roll cannot be determined). The author strings together quotations of Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, Aeschylus and Sophocles, and mentions Aratus prominently. The author's main interest in astronomy seems to be in connection with one or more of these authors, rather than in astronomy per se.

The top margin is 2.5 cm deep. Restoration of 25 and 28 on the basis of the quotations (not written in ekthesis) shows that the right edge of the fragment is within a letter or two of line-end. Thus 7–8 letters can be calculated as missing at the beginnings of 23–33, slightly more (8–10) in 1–22. Therefore the lines had c.30 letters, producing a column c.9 cm in width, as reconstructed, containing at least 33 lines for a height of at least 19.5 cm.

The hand is a bilinear, oval, sloping version of the mixed style. Letters show contrastive width, being taller than they are wide. ο is sometimes diminutive, floating in the middle as one would expect in the Severe Style, but is sometimes full height and oval, cocked slightly to the right. μ has a deep middle and ω curved sides meeting in the centre in an apex. φ with flattened top and triangular body pointing downward. ς has a top curving to the left over the apex in a hook, more pronounced in ς, λ. Tail of γ is in a loop, often closed. Development out of the Severe Style rather than into it is suggested. A date in the later third century is consistent with its reused front.

Punctuation is by high point (9, 16). Double consonants are separated by apostrophe (3 τ'τ), a practice whose advent is datable to the late second century (Turner, *GMAW*² p. 10 with n. 50). Diaeresis is not written internally (17 Πληιαδων), but is written initially in 8 and 10. The text exhibits iotacistic orthography (ει for ι, 6, 30; ι for ει 13), and at least one misspelling (11 ἀξιοφίςτως). The scribe does not write iota adscript, nor does he elide final vowels (19), wherever we can tell, except probably in the quotations in 26–7 (judged from spacing).

The subject as preserved is the usefulness of star-signs for weather or time-reckoning, as evidenced by the poets cited, or the fact that they attest this. The author quotes examples of weather-signs or astronomical time-reckoning from Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, and Sophocles, while quoting Callimachus in order to establish the affinity of Aratus with Hesiod. At the beginning of the column the author credits someone (Homer?) with views on the heaven (2–3) and as expressing this enigmatically (αἰ]γυττόμενος). There follow two citations from Homer that show Odysseus using the stars to keep time at night. Underscoring the interest of the stars to wise-men and sea-farers alike, the author adduces Hesiod's use of the stars in his *Opera et dies* as marking the time for harvest and ploughing (15–20) with a quotation of *Op.* 383–4 on the rising and setting of the Pleiades. After noting that Hesiod

was imitated by Aratus (23–4), and quoting as evidence for this Callim. *Epigr.* 27.1–3 Pf. (25–8), he then quotes the words of the watchman at Aesch. *Agam.* 4–5 asserting the usefulness of the stars for knowledge of the seasons (31–2). As the column breaks off, he is citing Sophocles, presumably to the same end. The author employs a somewhat florid rhetorical style in introducing the quotation from Aeschylus at 28–31. He admits hiatus (most egregiously in 25), and abbreviates quotations standard in the handbooks.

Lines 15–28 all deal in some way with Hesiod (as author of *Op.*), perhaps the focus of the author's interest as a source for star-lore. Another possible candidate is Aratus, named in 23, for whom the author has used elements of the *Lives* known from various versions in the medieval MSS, including the quotation of Callimachus *Epigr.* 27 Pf. to illustrate Aratus' use of Hesiod as a model. At 4–6 and 23–8 the text comes verbally close to phrasing in *Lives* I (by the grammarian Achilles), II, and IV (Martin), but then diverges dramatically, as it does in general throughout. Of the other five quotations in the papyrus (designated in the translation below), (i) (vii) and (viii) are a subset of those used to the same ends by the grammarian Achilles in his treatise *Περὶ τοῦ παντός* — in the order (viii) (vii) (i) — which along with *Life* I and a treatise on the interpretation of Aratus (*Περὶ ἐξηγήσεως*) stand in the medieval MSS of Aratus as an introduction to his *Phaenomena*. The text does not seem to be a commentary. If it is a *Vita Arati*, it is very different from the transmitted ones, including *Life* I, with which it shares material. Alternatively it could be a treatise of some sort, or an abridgement of Achilles' *Life of Aratus* for the purpose of rhetorical exercise, biography, or as the introduction to a commentary on Aratus' *Phaenomena*. On the identity of the author see further on 23–4.

Three papyri of Aratus bear brief marginal annotation: XV 1807 + P. Köln IV 185 (roll, ii AD); P. Lond. Lit. 34 + MPER III 17 (codex, iv AD); LXIV 4423 (roll, ii–iii AD). P. Berol. inv. 5865 = BKT 5.1 p. 54 (codex, iii–iv AD), edited by E. Maass, *Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae* (Berlin 1898) pp. lxix and 536 with Taff. 1–II (re-edited by M. Maehler, *APF* 27 (1980) 19–32 with Abb. 2) consists of scholia to Aratus' *Phaenomena*, and contains mythological and astronomical information in its annotation. The only example of a systematic hypnema on Aratus extant on a papyrus is LXIV 4426 (roll, ii/iii). Unlike that text, which consists of elementary verbal explanation and abbreviated paraphrase, the present text shows some signs, through its affinity with Achilles, of drawing on the tradition of astronomical scholarship represented in the later scholia.

The quotation of Hesiod *Op.* 383 in 17 exhibits at least one inferior reading that it shares with *Π*¹⁹ and several elements of the secondary tradition, and it may have had another in the lacuna in 18. The quotation of Callim. *Epigr.* 27. 1–3 Pf. gives in the first verse a unique and previously unattested variant (26 αοιδω], providing welcome and hitherto lacking ancient testimony for an emendation first proposed by Scaliger and now accepted by some editors and translators.

For the lives of Aratus we have used the numeration and text of J. Martin, *Histoire du texte des Phénomènes d'Aratos* (Paris 1956); for the ancient commentaries his *Scholia in Aratum vetera* (Leipzig 1974). For Achilles' *Εἰσαγωγή*, E. Maass' edition (Berlin 1898) has been

superseded by that of G. Di Maria, *Achillis quae feruntur Astronomica et in Aratum opuscula: De universo, De Arati vita, De Phaenomenorum interpretatione*, Studi e ricerche 27 (Palermo 1996). For the attribution of the *Eἰσαγωγή* to the grammarian Achilles (first proposed by Maass), see Martin, op. cit. pp. 130–2 and 140–50; Di Maria, op. cit. pp. vii–xii. Di Maria (p. xi n. 8) accepts the identification of the grammarian Achilles with Achilles Tatius, author of the romance *Leucippe and Clitophon*.

] καιεξ . . . ηνηςπαλιναυπο . [
] ησινδετωουρανωκλεις [
] . [. . . .] νιτ'τομενοσταιστων [
] αιςδιοικεισθαιπαντα [
 5] τ . σοφιστηνουμονονω [
] μνυνεαλλακαιηκρειβω [
] ανοναστραπαρεδωκεν . [
] σ . [.] αμον . ναλλακαιεντηι [
] χ . κεν . επλεωνυξ . τωνδ . [
 10] . . νομωνιναμηραπιστω [
] ε [. . . .] . τικαιαξιοφιστως . [
] ν [. . . .] σοφωκαινησιωτηω [
] . ρειδιαπιρανπλουηκον [
] επησταυταομοιωσηπε [
 15] ος . . . ασκραιοςκαιτανα [
] αιοτατατηςγεωργιας . [
] ετρειπληιαδωνατλα . [
] . ομενωνκαι . πιτοναμ [
] . ησενδυομενωνδεεπ . . [
 20] . αιοτε . . ιωνεστιντρυ . [
] . αρε . [.] . ακαι . λωστιν . [
] αιτις . οακροκν [.] φαιο . παρ [
] ηκαμενουδηαρατοςζη . [
] . ννησεγενετοωσμηδετον [
 25] ονεσφαλθαιειπονταησιοδ [
] ακαιοτροποςουτοναοιδω [
] οκνεωμητομελιχροτατο [
] νοσολευσαπεμαξατοκαιτη [
] . δεδικαιωσαντισειποιμη . [

30]τωνορφανηνοελευσειο[
]ατρωνκατο[]δανυκτηρω.[
]καιτουςφ.ρονταςχειμακα[
]οδεσοφοκλε[

1 beginning before *και*: feet of upright, last in series a complete upright after *εξ*: trace in upper-left quadrant and two traces at mid-level, then upright as of 1, followed by upright hooking to right at top end after *πo*: upright slanting right at top with hook over left, λ, Δ, λ suggested 2 beginning: foot of upright, bottom of round letter, ω suggested, foot of upright, round letter, o suggested, foot of upright before η: right end of high horizontal, perhaps connecting-stroke from preceding letter 3 top of upright as of 1 or flat tall back of c 5–11 first letter of each line preserved on a detached strip 5 hasta of τ is blotted and extends above the top-stroke 6 : far left edge round letter at mid-height as of o, ω 7 trace at mid-level suggesting far left edge of o, ω 8 after c slanting back of round letter as ε, c after *μoν*: upright with rounded top as of ε, o, c 9 after χ: trace at mid-level compatible with far left edge of ω after *κεν*: diagonal hooking over left at apex as of λ, Δ, λ end after *τoνδ*: trace of angled letter connecting to Δ at base-line as of λ, Δ, ε, c 10 before *νομ*: indistinguishable trace on edge at mid-height, then round letter as of o or ω, followed by top of upright with diagonal descending as from κ or perhaps η 11 before *τι*: two diagonals meeting at apex as in λ or λ or η end after *τωc*: upright connected at top to horizontal slanting upward as τ, π 13 trace of upright or right side of round letter as o, θ 15 after *oc*: round letter not closed at top as of ω, followed by upright, then small tight round letter with pointed bottom, o or c suggested 16 speck of high ink as high point or left tip of horizontal of τ 17 upright as of 1, τ, η, η 18 beginning before *ομ*: lower end of diagonal curving at base-line as of λ, μ, χ after *και*: upright curving to right at top as of ε, c 19 before *ηc*: connecting stroke from preceding letter at base-line as of e.g. λ, μ, χ end after *επ*: upright with horizontal connecting at top followed by foot of upright at base-line as π or ιτ 20 before *αιo*: end of high diagonal or horizontal as of κ, γ or τ after *τε*: right and left sides of a round letter as of o, θ or ω (if narrower than elsewhere), then small tight high circle as of ρ end after *τoν*: upright with high horizontal attached as of τ, π 21 beginning: top of upright connecting to vertical stroke with rounded hook at top and finishing in a foot extending to the right at baseline, π only if more cursive in form than elsewhere (cf. π 13 *πoυ*); not μ, κ, c after *αρε*: upright with horizontal connecting at top as of τ, π before *ακαι*: vertical stroke slanting to right at top as of 1, η, η, π after *ακαι*: trace of vertical ink compatible with upright or side of round letter end after *τω*: upright with rounded hook at bottom as of ε, c 22 after *τιc*: speck of ink centred in space at mid-level after *αιo*: top of upright with curved stroke attached at top as of τ, c 23 upright slanting to right at top as of λ, μ 24 horizontal slanting upwards at right as of τ or tongue of ε 29 beginning: diagonal joining to base of upright, η suggested end: upright connecting to horizontal at top as τ, π, but the latter slightly preferable given the finial 31 upright in left half of space as τ, η, κ, η, π 32 top of high bowl as o, θ, ρ 33 tops of five letters: (i) high horizontal ink as ζ, π, τ, o; (ii) c or right arm of γ; (iii) c or ε; (iv) prima facie η (but narrower than elsewhere); (v) top of diagonal in middle of space as λ, λ; not Δ

.] και ξξ εἰρήνης πάλιν αὖ πολ[ε-
 μ . . .] φησιν δὲ τῷ οὐρανῷ κλειc[(. .)
] . . . [. . . αἰ]νιττόμενος ταῖς τῶν [
 ἄστρων ἀνατολ]αῖς διοικεῖσθαι πάντα τ[ἄ
 5 καθ' ἡμάς, ὥστε] τὸν σοφιστὴν οὐ μόνον ᾤ[-
 κείωσεν καὶ ἐc[μυνηεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠκρεῖβω[-

- 56 *κεν. τὰ δὲ κατ' οὐρανὸν ἄστρα παρέδωκεν οἱ*
κ ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσεύει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰλι-
άδι φησὶ “*ἱπαροίχῳκεν δὲ πλέω νύξ· / τῶν δὲ*
 10 *μοιράων*” [*προ*]οικονομῶν ἵνα μὴ ἀπιστῶ[*σι*
καὶ] “*Ἰπληιάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι*” καὶ ἀξιοφίςτως [*σι*
]ν[.]σοφῶ καὶ νησιώτῳ [*σι*
]· *σι εἰς διάπ(ε)ριαν πλοῦ ἠκόν[τι,*
ἀλλ' ἔγνω μὲν ὁ ἦδυεπῆς ταῦτα ὁμοίως. ἦπερ
 15 *ρώτης δὲ γεωργ]ός ὣν ὁ Ἄσκραϊός καὶ τὰ ναυ-*
τικὰ ἀγνοῶν, τὰ δὲ βεβ]αιότατα τῆς γεωργίας,
τὰς ὄρας καταμ]ετρεῖ “*Ἰπληιάδων Ἀτλαιγε-*
νέων[.] *τελ]λομενάων*” καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄμ[η-
 τον τότε ἐξώρ]μησεν, “*δυομένων*” δὲ ἐπὶ τ[ὸν
 20 *ἄροτον, καθάπερ] καὶ ὅτε Ὁρίων ἐστὶν τρυχ[*
] *παρε* . [.] *α καὶ ὄλωσι τινέ[σι*
φασιν, ὅταν κ]αὶ τις ὁ “ἀκροκν[έ]φαιος” παρ[ῆ].
ὡς δὲ προειρ]γάμεν, οὐδὲ δὴ Ἄρατος ζηλ[ω-
 25 *τῆς οὐκ ἀ]γενῆς ἐγένετο, ὡς μὴδὲ τὸν [*
] *ον ἐσφάλθαι εἰπόντα “Ἡσιόδου*
το] [.] ἱάεισιμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν αἰοιδῶν / ἔ-
σχατον ἀλλ' ὁ κνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον /
τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο”. καὶ τῆ[ν
 30 *ρήσιν τῆ]νδε, δικαίως ἂν τις εἴποι μὴ γ[νώ-*
σεως τοῦ]των ὀρφανῆν, ὁ Ἐλευσεινίος
τραγωδεῖ] “*ἄστρων κάτοιδα νυκτέρων ἱδ-*
μήγυριν / καὶ τοὺς φέροντας χεῖμα καὶ
θέρος” .] ὁ δὲ Σοφοκλέους *Να[ύπλιος*

- Il. 10. 252–3*
Od. 5. 272
Hes. Op. 383
Hes. Op. 384
Hes. Op. 567
Vitae Arati I. 64–8 (cf. 7–8),
II. 22–3, III. 35–6, IV. 26
Callim. Epigr. 27. 1–3 Pf.
Aesch. Agam. 4–5
Soph. Naupl. TGrF IV 432

. . . after peace yet again war (*several words missing*). He says that for the heaven . . . expressing in a veiled way that all our affairs are controlled by the risings of stars, so that he not only appropriates the rôle of the wise man and speaks impressively, but also is scientifically accurate. He has related the stars in the heaven not only in the *Odyssey*, but also in the *Iliad*, controlling his composition in advance in order that they not find it unconvincing, he says (10. 252–3)

- (i) The greater part of the night has passed;
of the two parts

and (*Od.* 5. 272)

- (ii) keeping his eye on the Pleiades

and (*several words missing*) plausibly (*several words missing*) to a clever man and an islander and having come to experience sailing, while the poet knew these (nautical) things likewise. But Hesiod, being a farmer from the mainland and not knowing things about sailing, but rather (knowing) the most dependable aspects of farming, measures the year from (*Op.* 383)

- (iii) the rising of the Pleiades, daughters of Atlas

and sallied forth to the harvesting, and from (*Op.* 383)

- (iv) their setting

(sallied forth) to the ploughing, exactly as when Orion is (*several words missing*) grape-harvest, and some say entirely so, when the star (*Op.* 576)

- (v) rising at dusk

is also present in some places. As I said previously, Aratus was indeed no mean imitator of him (sc. Hesiod), seeing that Callimachus did not err when he said (*Epigr.* 27. 1–3 Pf.)

- (vi) It's Hesiod's music and it's Hesiod's genre:
not the ultimate one that poets (or: poems?) can have,
but blimey if Aratus of Soli hasn't taken as a model
the best of his verses.

The following speech, one might justly say not bereft of knowledge in this matter, Aeschylus of Eleusis composes in the tragic style (*Agam.* 4–5)

- (vii) I know the assembled company of stars that wander in the night,
and the ones that bring on for mortals the winter and summer.

Moreover the *Nauplios* of Sophocles (says) (*TGrF* IV 432)

- (viii) . . .

1–2 και ἐξ εἰρήνης πάλω αὐ πολ[εμ]. For the phrasing, cf. Lucian, *De parasito* 39. 5 εἰς, ὃ βέλτιστε, καιροὶ τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίου, ὁ μὲν τις εἰρήνης, ὁ δ' αὐ πολέμου. The reference may be to *Il.* 18. 490 ff., the city at peace and the city at war. Or we could have a contrast between Homer and Hesiod on war vs. peace: Hesiod's treatment of star signs in *Opera* as opposed to the emphasis on war in Homer's poetry. For the contrast (without appeal to the stars) see *Certamen* 205–12 (cf. T 22. 81–2 Colonna) ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἐστεφάνωσεν εἰπὼν δίκαιον εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ γεωργίαν καὶ εἰρήνην προκαλούμενον νικᾶν, οὐ τὸν πολέμους καὶ σφαγὰς διεξιόντα (follows directly after Hesiod's recitation of *Op.* 383–92, against Homer's of *Il.* 13. 126–33, 339–44). The following lines here, however, give quotations showing Homer's use of the stars for practical purposes. πάλω with the opposites war and peace might suggest perpetual recurrence, such as is found in the regular reappearance of star-signs.

2 φησιν. Homer is the most likely subject (less likely the Hesiod of *Op.* or the Hesiodic Ἀστρονομία), in light of the quotations that follow in 7–10, and the absence of a place for the introduction of his name in the following lines.

τῷ οὐρανῷ. In Homer οὐρανός is the abode of the gods, not the place of the stars, but see *Il.* 18. 483 ἐν μὲν γαίαν ἔτευξ', ἐν δ' οὐρανόν, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν, *Od.* 5. 273 ἐν δέ τε τεύρεα πάντα, τά τ' οὐρανὸς ἐστεφάνωται (both cited by Achilles, *De universo* 1,9–11 Di Maria = p. 29,30–30,6 Maass).

κλειε[. One could posit τῷ οὐρανῷ κλειε[| [τὰ ἄστρα εἰ]ῆναι (i.e. κλειε[= κλειδαε[; for the contracted form, standard in later authors: e.g. Plut. *Anat.* 23. 4. 4 and often: see LSJ s.v. κλειε[and Suppl. s.v. 1 3). κλειε[in the metaphorical sense of 'means of access' (for which see LSJ s.v. 1 4) is not earlier than Aeschylus and Pindar: see Aesch. *TiGF* III 316 ἔστι κάμοι κληε[ἐπὶ γλώσσει; Pi. *P.* 8. 4 Ἀκυρία βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολέμων ἔχοισα κλαῖδα (cf. 9. 39); cf. Soph. *OC* 1052 (lyr.); Eur. *Med.* 661 (lyr.) καθαρὰν ἀνοῖξαι κληῖδα φρενῶν (of Aphrodite); Aristoph. *Thesm.* 976 (lyr.) κληῖδας γάμον φιλάττει (of Hera), perhaps with allusion to the sacred keys of temples held by cult officials. It is not examined in Homer, Hesiod or Aratus (at *Phaen.* 192 οἷη δὲ κληῖδι θύρην ἔντοσθ' ἀραρυῖαν Aratus compares Cassiopeia to the 'key of a two-fold door', but that passage can hardly be the reference of κλειε[here). For its use in the sense of a 'key' to a problem, 'means of understanding', see e.g. Vett. Val. 179. 4 Pingree. However, κλειε[also means 'bar' or 'bolt', and if that is the operant sense here, the reference might be to the stars as guarantors of the fixity of the heaven (cf. Parmenides fr. 1,14 D.–K.). But 'keys to the heaven' is a phrase used neither by Homer nor by Aratus or Hesiod. If Homer is the subject of φησιν, the author is not quoting or paraphrasing a specific passage, but giving his own interpretation of what Homer says (perhaps the point of 3 αἰ]νιττόμενος). The construction with the dative is odd (one expects genitive, as at *Matth.* 16. 19 δώσω σοι τὰς κλειδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν). Professor Parsons suggests τῷ οὐρανῷ κλειε[[τῆν εἶναι] τ[ῆν γῆν, noting that some MSS of Cornutus quote Hes. *Theog.* 271 with περὶ πάσαν ἔεργοι.

3 αἰ]νιττόμενος advances an interpretation of what Homer says literally in the quotations in 7–10.

4 ἄστρον ἀνατολ]αῖς (Parsons). Cf. Joh. Damasc. *Exp. Fidei* 21.

4–5 τ[ὰ καθ' ἡμῶν (Parsons), πράγματα, ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ or the like must have stood here.

5 τὸν σοφιστήν. Presumably a predecessor (i.e. Orpheus or Musaeus?), or a philosopher whose doctrines he (sc. Homer?) anticipated. According to Achilles, *De universo* 1,9–11 Di Maria (= p. 30,13–14 Maass), both Crates and Apion Pleistonices attest ὅτι ἀστρονόμος Ὀμηρος. For claims for a philosophical basis for the astronomy of Aratus, see *Vit. Arati* II 29–30 Martin ἐχρήσατο γὰρ τῆ τῶν φυσικῶν φιλοσόφων δυνάμει. εἶναι γὰρ φησι τὸ διοικοῦν τὸν κόσμον ἀκριβῶς περὶ τε τοὺς ἐνιαυτοὺς καὶ μῆνας καὶ ἡμέρας. Here διοικοῦν seems to correspond to 4 διοικεῖσθαι and ἀκριβῶς to 6–7 ἠκριβῶσ[εν].

7 τὰ δὲ κατ' οὐρ]ανόν: as in Achilles, *De universo* 1,9–11 Di Maria (= p. 30,8–9 Maass). Οἱ κατὰ τὸ πιθ]ανόν?

ἄστρα παρέδωκεν: i.e. Homer transmits a useful account of the stars. In the case of the *Iliad*, the reference (as the quotation shows) is to *Il.* 10. 252–3. In the case of the *Odyssey*, the reference may be to *Od.* 12. 312:

ἦμος δὲ τρίχα νυκτὸς ἔην, μετὰ δ' ἄστρα βεβήκει

or to *Od.* 5. 272–5 (272 is apparently quoted in 11). Also relevant for Homer's scientifically accurate use of star-signs is *Il.* 18. 483–6 (constellations on Achilles' shield). In all except the last the speaker is Odysseus and the subject is the reckoning of the hours at night by the stars. But there is no room in these lines to restore the name of Homer or Odysseus. (ο[at the end of 7 offers such an opportunity, but then there will not be room for οὐκ, necessary in 8.) Presumably Homer's name appeared in the lines preceding this column.

8–9 ἐν τῇ Ἰ]λιάδι. Citation of the title here is assured by the diaeresis over ι.

9–10 *Il.* 10. 252–3:

ἄστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παροίχωκεν δὲ πλέων νῦξ
τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λείπειται.

These lines are quoted by Achilles, *De universo* 1,9–11 Di Maria (= p. 30,8–9 Maass) in a list of Homeric passages cited to substantiate that Homer spoke περὶ ἄστρον, περὶ ὄλων and περὶ ἀστρολογίαε.

9 -χωκεν with Dorotheus, ApD, EtG, Epm., W: -χηκε(ν) ΣD, Achilles (loc. cit.), Porph. *Il.* 147. 12 Schr., Z Ω*: πλέω with ΣD, Achilles (loc. cit.), Z Ω*: πλέων Porph. *Il.* 147. 12 Schr.: πλείων G: πλέων W: πλεο Choer.

10 μοιράων]. The entire line *Il.* 10. 253 τῶν δύο μοιράων, τρίτατη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λείπεται was omitted by Zenodotus and athetized by Aristophanes and Aristarchus (so Schol. A *Il.* 253a), apparently occasioning its imitation by Apollonius of Rhodes 3. 1340-1 Ἥμιος δὲ τρίτατον λάχος ἤματος ἀνομένοιο / λείπεται ἐξ ἡοῦς; see U. v. Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin 1916) 60; A. Rengakos, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 64 (Stuttgart 1993) 70. For the stars as indicators of time see O. Wenskus, *Astronomische Zeitangaben von Homer bis Theophrast*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 55 (Stuttgart 1990).

10-11 προικονομῶν: This and the quotation of *Od.* 5. 272 in 11 are recovered from Schol. T on *Il.* 10. 252-3, commenting on πλέω νύξ / τῶν δύο μοιράων: ὄθεν καὶ τὸ “Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσώρωντι” (*Od.* 5. 272) φησὶ περὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσεύος. προικονομεῖ οὖν, φασί, τὴν Ὀδύσειαν. For the sense of προικονομέω (sc. τὴν Ὀδύσειαν) referring to unity and consistency in Homer's plan for the poems as wholes, see Schol. *Il.* 2. 260a Erbse and cf. Schol. *Il.* 10. 247b Erbse.

11 *Od.* 5. 272. At 272-7 Calypso has given Odysseus elaborate instructions for navigation by the Pleiades, Boötes, the Bear (a.k.a. the Wagon) and Orion, advising him to keep the Bear on his left:

Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσώρωντι καὶ ὀψὲ δύνοντα Βοώτην
 ἄρκτον θ', ἣν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπέκλησιν καλέουσιν,
 ἣ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεύει,
 οὔτ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο·
 τὴν γὰρ δὴ μιν ἄνωγε Καλυψώ, δία θεάων,
 ποντοπορευόμεναι ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ χεῖρὸς ἔχοντα.

ἀξιοφίτως. For the spelling see Threatte, *Grammar* 1 p. 468, possibly a mere misspelling of ἀξιοπίτως (could it have been induced by 5 σοφιστήν?).

11-15 These lines appear to contrast the island-born Homer, who therefore (in the *Odyssey* in connection with Odysseus) related astronomical phenomena to navigation, with the non-sailing and agricultural Hesiod (who used star-signs to mark the seasons appropriate to different agricultural activities). 12 νησιώτη might refer to Homer the Chiot, 13 to Hesiod as someone 'who has [rarely] come to experience sea-travel'. But Schol. T on *Iliad* 10. 252-3 suggests the approach followed in the reconstruction: Homer says this in order to construct a convincing portrait of Odysseus. 12-14 might have continued 'and this utterance could be plausibly (11 ἀξιοφίτως) ascribed to Odysseus, a clever man and an islander (σοφῶ καὶ νησιώτη) and because of profit having frequently come to experience sailing' (e.g. καὶ ἀξιοφίτως τ[ο]τ[ο] ἀναφέρει]ν [ἀνδρὶ] σοφῶ καὶ νησιώτη ὠ[φελεία πολλὰκ]ι εἰς διάπ(ε)ιραν πλοῦ ἡκόν[τι]).

13 εἰς διάπ(ε)ιραν πλοῦ ἡκον]. For the idiom see Hdt. 2. 77 τῶν ἐς διάπειραν ἀπικόμην; id. 1. 47 ἀπέπεμπε ἐς τὴν διάπειραν τῶν χρηστηρίων; Demosth. 44. 58, 56. 18 τὸ πρᾶγμα εἰς διάπειραν καὶ λόγον κατέστησαν; Aeschin. 1. 184. The proof of the usefulness of astronomy comes from practical experience (sailing and farming) and observation of signs as required for those pursuits. The same theme is struck up and poetic authorities are quoted in a similar series in the treatise of Achilles, *De universo* 1,1-2 Di Maria (= p. 28,7-16 Maass) to instantiate the beginnings of astronomy: τῶ κατακόπτω τὴν ἐμπειρίαν περιτίθει ποιῶν (sc. Αἰσχύλος; cf. 27. 6, 30. 15 εὐρηθῆναι). Achilles then quotes Aesch. *Agam.* 4-6, as does the present text below at 31-3.

14 ὁ ἦδυσ]επής (Parsons): sc. Homer.

ταῦτα: sc. ναυτικά (cf. 15-16).

ὄμοίως: i.e. just like Odysseus.

14-15 ἦπε[ι]ρώτης (Parsons) provides the obvious contrast to 12 νησιώτη. Less certain is γεωργ]ός; we could instead have Ἡσιόδ]ος (but see next note).

15 ὁ Ἀκραῖος: viz. Hesiod. The practice of referring in citations and quotations to a known individual by his ethnic is a Hellenistic affectation which reflects methods of Alexandrian scholarship in cataloguing, indexing (*pinakes*), and biography. (Early instances such as 'Simonides Amorginos' are poetic.) Such a designation, often better and more securely known than a patronymic, was employed in order to disambiguate otherwise homonymous individuals (as undertaken e.g. in Demetrius of Magnesia's *Περὶ συνωνύμων*, often cited by Diog. Laer.: see J. Mejer, 'Demetrius of Magnesia: On Poets and Authors of the Same Name', *Hermes* 109 (1981) 447-72). For this

type of *antonomasia* in poetry with ample instances in Augustan Latin verse, see J. Farrell, *Vergil's Georgics* (New York and Oxford 1991) 33–5, who identifies it (p. 35) as ‘in the Alexandrian mold’, used ‘to designate the symbolic Hesiod of the Alexandrians’ (pp. 35–46 for examples from Greek predecessors). As in the use of this idiom (foreign to English) in modern Romance languages, the adjective with the definite article alone substitutes for the name of the person under discussion; i.e. the article plus ethnic substitutes for mention of the name, which need not have previously appeared. Thus we would not expect to find the name of Hesiod at the beginning of 15 (where it is allowed by]οc), nor Aeschylus’ name, for example, at the beginning of 31. Conversely it is not necessary to have the ethnic of Aratus (since he is mentioned by name) in the missing portion of 23. The principle is well illustrated by Callim. *Epigr.* 27 Pf. quoted on 25–8 below: for the epigram, *ὁ Κολοεύς* alone suffices. Aratus’ name itself appears independently in 4 lest there be any doubt which Solian is meant.

15–16 τὰ: sc. *σημεῖα*? If so, *να[υτικά* (or perhaps *ναυτιλιας*) would pair or contrast relevantly with *τῆς γεωργίας* (although the same star-signs might not be useful in both cases). Weather signs were primarily useful to farmers and mariners: this is implied by Vegetius 4.41.6 on signs from birds and fishes with reference to Vergil in the *Georgics* and Varro *in libris navalibus*; cf. Pindar *O.* 11: sometimes there’s a need for rain [i.e. for farmers] and sometimes for wind [i.e. for sailors]. Only rarely are other professions mentioned: physicians (in the Hippocratic *Airs Waters Places*); millers (Aratus 10.44–6), and anglers (P. Mil. Vogl. viii 309 iv 20–9 = Posidippus *Epigr.* 23–4 A.-B.).

17 καταμ]ετρεῖ. Something similar in Achilles, *De universo* 1.9–11 Di Maria = p. 30,8–9 Maass on *Il.* 10. 252–3: *στρατιώτης νυκτομαχῶν τοῖς ἄστροις τὴν νύκτα μετρεῖ.*

17–18 Hes. *Op.* 383, quoted by Σ Arat. 264. For the Pleiades see on 19.

Ἀτλαί, γει[ρέων with Π¹⁹, Dio Prus. 2. 9, Athen. 489f.: ἀτλαγενέων all MSS, *Cert. Hom. et Hes.* 12. 180, Gemin. *Elem. astr.* 17. 14, Σ Arat. 137, Prob. in Verg. *E.* 3. 40, Et., s.v. *πλειάς*, Greg. Cor. p. 578 Sch., Tzetzes *Vit. Hes.* 1. 79 Colonna², Eust. 1155. 49, Σ Aesch. *PV* 428: ἀτληγενέων Σ AD *Il.* 18. 486; cf. Max. Tyr. p. 294. 8 H.: [Π¹⁹].

18]τελλομένων: ἐπιτελλ- all MSS, Π³⁹, Σ Pr, Athen. 489f., *Cert. Hom. et Hes.* 12. 180, Gemin. *Elem. astr.* 17. 14, Σ Arat. 137, Prob. in Verg. *E.* 3. 40, Et., s.v. *πλειάς*, Greg. Cor. p. 578 Sch., Tzetzes *Vit. Hes.* 1. 79 Colonna²: περιτελλ- Dio Prus. 2. 9, Max. Tyr. p. 294. 8 H.: [Π¹⁹]. Spacing at the beginning of the line admits *περιτελλ-* in the papyrus, but is not conclusive.

18–19]τελλομένων — *δνομένων*. The point seems to be that Hesiod attached significance to what is seen at the setting of certain stars as well as at their rising (to which the Greeks attached most significance: M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 379). Thus the beginning of the summary gives an example of stars he treated as significant in their observed rising (17 Pleiades), while 19 (*δνομένων*, also the Pleiades: *Op.* 384) refers to their setting. Similarly 20–2 may treat stars observed both at rising and setting, but this is not certain.

19 *δνομένων*. Hes. *Op.* 384, quoted by Σ Arat. 264. The papyrus here agrees with the reading of the quotation in Σ Arat. 264: *δουαμενάων* Π¹⁹ and all MSS: *δνομενάων* Dio Prus. 2. 9, Max. Tyr. p. 294. 8 H. The setting of the Pleiades is also mentioned in no less than three fragments of the Hesiodic *Ἀστρονομία*: fr. 288 τὰς δὲ βροτοὶ καλοῦσι Πηλειάδες, fr. 289 χειμέρια δύνουσι Πηλειάδες and 290 M.-W. τῆμος ἀποκρύπτουσι Πηλειάδες — all three from Athen. xi 80 p. 491 d.

ἐπὶ τὸν ἀμ]ητον glosses Hes. *Op.* 384 ἀμήτου.

19–20 ἐπὶ τ[ὸν ἄροτον glosses Hes. *Op.* 384 ἄρότοι.

20 Perhaps ὅτε Ὁρίων ἐστὶν τρυγ[ή], or ὅτε Ὁρίων, ἐστὶν τρυγ[ή], ‘When Orion (sc. is rising), it is the time of the grape-harvest’. But we could also have e.g. τρυγ[ῆς μνηστέον οἱ τρυγ[ῆν κελεύει (Parsons). See Hes. *Op.* 609–17: ‘When Orion and Sirius come into mid-heaven (i.e. in September), and rosy-fingered dawn sees Arcturus (cf. 22), then cut off all the grape-clusters, Perses, and bring them home. Show them to the sun ten days and ten nights: then cover them over for five, and on the sixth day draw off into vessels the gifts of joyful Dionysus. But when the Pleiades and Hyades and strong Orion begin to set (i.e. at the end of October), then remember to plough in season.’ We ought then to expect a reference to Orion rising (marking the time of the grape-harvest), followed by a reference to his setting (marking the time of ploughing), or to the rising of Arcturus (see on 22) (marking the time for pruning).

22 ἀκροκν[έ]φαιος: ‘rising at dusk’. The reference is to *Op.* 567 (the only occurrence in Hesiod) *πρώτον παμφαίνων ἐπιτέλλεται ἀκροκνέφαιος* of Arcturus rising in February-March, 60 days after the solstice, the ac-

ronychal rising (see West ad loc. and p. 379). According to *Op.* 570 this is the time to prune the vines, οὐκ ἀγρονόμος, but I cannot see how to get this out of the papyrus here.

23 ὥς δὲ προειρήκαμεν, οὐ δὴ Ἄρατος. Alternatively, we could articulate and restore a statement as follows: καὶ τοῦ προηκαμένου (sc. Ἡσιόδου) δὴ Ἄρατος κτλ., i.e. Aratus was an imitator of his predecessor Hesiod. That the author did in fact think Aratus an imitator of Hesiod seems the only possible explanation why he adduces the epigram of Callimachus that follows. Other reconstructions are possible (as a question): e.g. καὶ ἄρα, ὥς εἰρήκαμεν (or ἐξήγητήκαμεν?), οὐ δὴ Ἄρατος κτλ.;

οὐδ. sc. Ἡσιόδου.

23–4 ζηλ[ωτής οὐκ ἀγ]ρονόμος: sc. τοῦ Ἡσιόδου. Aratus imitator of Hesiod. For the litotes οὐκ ἀγενής, unexpectedly common in later Greek, see e.g. Plat. *Charm.* 158c. The author therefore cannot be Theon of Alexandria, author of the extant *Life* III (Martin) of Aratus, for he takes no note of Aratus' relationship to Homer or Hesiod. Nor can he be the Stoic philosopher Boëthus of Sidon who wrote a book *Περὶ Ἀράτου* now lost (cf. Geminus, *Isag.* 14, Cic. *De div.* 1. 8. 13, Σ Arat. 1091), since according to *Vit. Arati* II (12. 15–16 Martin) he argued in it that Aratus imitated Homer rather than Hesiod, whereas the author of the papyrus here quotes Callim. *Epigr.* 27. 1–3 Pf. in support of the view that Aratus emulated Hesiod. *Vit. Arati* II (loc. cit.) maintains that Aratus was an 'imitator of the Homeric style in his composition of words' (quoted below), noting that others claimed he was an imitator of Hesiod: they cited Hesiod's invocation of Zeus in the proem of *Op.* and his portrayal of the Golden Age and πολλοὺς ἄλλους μύθους as elements in common with Aratus demonstrating the latter's dependence. The *Life* then notes that the Stoic Boëthus, however, in his *Περὶ Ἀράτου* said that Aratus was a ζηλωτής of Homer rather than of Hesiod for the reason that 'the substance of his poetry was greater than in the case of Hesiod' (πλάσμα τῆς ποιήσεως μείζον ἢ κατὰ Ἡσιόδου). Boëthus' interest in making Homer's rather than Hesiod's poetry foundational for Aratus' poetry is explained in part by the philosophers' contention that all *artes* and τέχναι were prefigured in Homer (see Achilles, *De universo* 1.9–11 Di Maria = p. 30,8–9 Maass). There are vestiges of this view in the papyrus' quotations of Homer at 7–10. Callimachus' motive was altogether different: he makes Hesiod rather than Homer Aratus' model in order to align him with Alexandrian poetic fashion: small in scope, recherché in subject, refined in treatment. Cf. *Epigr.* 27. 3–4 χαίρετε λεπταί / ῥήσεις, Ἀράτου σύμβολον ἀγρονόμος, 'We praise these terse, subtle tokens of long effort at night' (S. Lombardo and D. Rayor, *Callimachus: Hymns, Epigrams, Select Fragments* (Baltimore 1988) 60). It refers to the genre and style of Aratus' poetry and not to its contents: according to other prose sources Aratus was versifying Eudoxus (Hipparchus 1.2.2 and *Vit. Arati* III, pp. 15.33–16.2 Martin; for Eudoxus' work on weather signs, cf. Gemin. *Eisagoge* 17.47–9 = Eudoxus fr. 139 Lasserre). The motive of the author of the papyrus text may be different still: he seems to cite Callimachus' epigram to substantiate his claim that (like Hesiod) Aratus subscribed to the value, reliability and application of astronomy. This could suggest a more limited scope and theme for the papyrus text, such as might be appropriate to a declamation than biography or science or philosophy proper. On the rhetorical element, see further on 29. On Aratus' debt to Hesiod, see also R. Hunter, 'Written in the stars: Poetry and philosophy in the *Phaenomena* of Aratus', *Arachnion* 2 (1995) 1–34 (esp. 2–4) at <http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num2/hunter.html>; M. Fantuzzi, R. Hunter, *Muse e modelli* (Roma/Bari 2002) 302–22, 329–32; C. Fakas, *Der hellenistische Hesiod: Arats Phainomena und die Tradition der antiken Lehreibik* (Wiesbaden 2001).

The phrase Ἄρατος ζηλ[ωτής οὐκ ἀγ]ρονόμος ἐγένετο ὥς is related verbally to the text of the ancient *Lives* of Aratus; it may well witness the text of the ancient exemplar from which they descend: *Vit. Arati* I 64–8 (Martin) γέγονε δὲ ὁ Ἄρατος ζηλωτής Ἡσιόδου, ὥς Καλλίμαχος παρεσημάτα τοῦτο διὰ τοῦ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπιγράμματος οὕτως [quotes Callim. *Epigr.* 27. 2–3 only] (cf. 7–8 where he quotes vv. 2–3 to invoke Callimachus' authority for the proposition that Aratus was from Soli, against Asclepiades of Myrlea who said that he was from Tarsus). Cf. *Vit. Arati* II 14–24 (Martin) ζηλωτής δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ χαρακτήρος κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπεῶν σύνθεσιν. εἰμοὶ δὲ αὐτὸν λέγουσιν Ἡσιόδου μᾶλλον ζηλωτὴν γεγονέναι . . . Βόηθος δὲ ὁ Κιδώνιος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ αὐτοῦ φησὶν οὐκ Ἡσιόδου αὐτὸν ζηλωτὴν, ἀλλ' Ὀμήρου γεγονέναι· τὸ γὰρ πλάσμα τῆς ποιήσεως μείζον ἢ κατὰ Ἡσιόδου; *Vit. Arati* IV 23–6 (Martin) [= *Comment. in Arat. rel.* p. 326. 13–14 Maass] γηραιὸν δὲ τῷ Κυρηναίῳ ἐπεβάλετο, παρ' οὐ καὶ ἐπιγράμματος [sc. 27 Pf.] ἠξιώθη . . . ζηλωτὴν δὲ φασι τοῦτον γενέσθαι Ὀμήρου, οἱ δὲ Ἡσιόδου μᾶλλον. None of these calls Aratus οὐκ ἀγενής (as well as a ζηλωτής) of Hesiod, but οὐκ ἀγενής sounds suspiciously like the corruption at *Vit. Arati* III 35–6 (Martin) ὁ Καλλίμαχος συνεγγίζων αὐτῷ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους (τοῦ) Ἀράτου † κύργου † ἀγρονόμος τῆς

τῶν Φαινομένων θεωρίας διὰ τὴν παρατήρησιν. The pairing of οὐκ ἀγεννῆς with ζηλωτής (as in the papyrus) in the introduction of this epigram in literature connected with Aratus might explain the corruption † *κύγγονος* † in the *Ljfe*.

25]ον. The only uncertainty here is whether to restore at the beginning of the line Callimachus' name, Καλλιμάχ]ον, or, as Dr Gonis suggests, his ethnic Κυρηναί]ον.

25–8 Callim. *Epigr.* 27. 1–3 Pf. = LV1 G.–P. written as prose, variously quoted by the *Vitae Arati*:

Ἡσιόδου τό τ' ἄειμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν
ἔχρατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Κολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο· χαίρετε λεπταί
ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου κύμβολον ἀγρυννίης.

1 τό τ', ἀοιδῶν see below on 26 4 κύμβολον ἀγρυννίης Ruhnken, whence Pfeiffer: *κύντονος ἀγρυννίη* AP: *κύγγονος ἀγρυννίης* *Vit. Arati* 1 69 (Martin), Theon (= *Vit. Arati* III 35–6 Martin), whence *κύγγονοι ἀγρυννίης* Scaliger (but see above on 23–4)

26 το] [.]₁ἄειμα, α: τοδ' ἄειμα AP IX 507, Achilles *De Arati vita* 5 Di Maria (= *Vit.* 1 66 Martin): τό τ' Blomfield, whence Pfeiffer. Presumably the papyrus had either δ(ε) or τ(ε) with the epsilon elided before ἄειμα. Elsewhere (19) the scribe writes *scriptio plena*, but he might be expected to elide thus in quotations of poetry (cf. on 27).

ἀοιδῶ₁ν₁. So Scaliger conjectured, followed by Pfeiffer and some modern editors: ἀοιδόν MSS AP IX 507, Achilles *De Arati vita* 5 Di Maria (= *Vit.* 1 66 Martin), printed by various editors including A. S. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965) 1 71 (Callim. *Epigr.* LV1), G. R. Mair, *Callimachus: Hymns and Epigrams* (London 1921) 156, Merkelbach–West Test. ad Hes. *Astron.* (ed. maior p. 148), and A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995) 374 ff., and defended e.g. by G. Kaibel, *Hermes* 29 (1894) 120, as meaning 'he may not be the consummate poet, but . . .'. However, the word-order is odd, and the accusative is left without a controlling verb. The papyrus' reading ἀοιδῶ₁ν₁ is unique among the witnesses, of which this is the first ancient attestation.

26–7 τὸν ἀοιδῶ₁ν₁ / ἔχρατον. The antecedent of τὸν ἔχρατον must be *τρόπος*, which is proximate (ἄειμα and ἔπος are excluded by their gender, and understanding a word like *εἰχλος* is difficult if not impossible). Thus: 'the ultimate mode'. ἀοιδῶν nested in this way may mean 'belonging to poets', 'that poets can have' (alternatively, however, Professor R. Hunter suggests to us that ἀοιδῶν is from ἀοιδή rather than ἀοιδός: 'that poems can have'), i.e. Epic (cf. Lombardo and Rayor, op. cit. p. 60, who render τὸν ἀοιδῶν / ἔχρατον as 'the ultimate Epic') or at any rate something grander (and more pompous and pretentious) than Hesiod's didactic *Op.* The commentator clearly understood this to refer to Homer's large-scale epic poetry, for it stands in contrast to Aratus' alleged imitation of Hesiod's subtle and refined style and erudite subject-matter and didactic presentation, over against the view that Aratus imitated Homer as the teacher of all things.

In Callimachus' epigram, however, τὸ μελιχρότατον / τῶν ἐπέων involves an ironic and more complicated pun: Aratus used as a model the best of Hesiod's ἔπη, i.e. from his didactic *Works and Days*. These were hexameter verses (one sense of ἔπη), though they were not from an epic poem on the scale of Homer's (another connotation of ἔπη), as 1–2 οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν / ἔχρατον points out. (Cameron, op. cit., queries whether ἔχρατοι can mean 'ultimate' in a good sense.)

The poetry of Aratus referred to in Callimachus' epigram is generally taken to be the *Phaenomena* (according to the *Vitae* he wrote numerous other poems). It is sometimes doubted what work of Hesiod Callimachus had in mind. Merkelbach–West take it to be the Hesiodic *Astronomia*, an eccentric choice, and so print the epigram (with the reading ἀοιδόν of the MSS) as a testimonium to the fragments of that poem (*Fragmenta Hesiodica*, Oxford 1967, p. 148). However, the fact that the quotation of Callimachus, *Epigr.* 27 follows directly on from the quotation at 17–19 above of Hes. *Op.* 383 ff. and its discussion seems to show that the author of the present text at any rate took it to refer to the *Days* portion of the *Works and Days*, especially 383–end, with its very rich use of star-signs as indicators of the seasons and calendar. On the other hand, he may not have given the epigram's implications much thought, apart from its link between Hesiod and Aratus.

ἔχρατον ἀλλ' ὀκνέω. It is not certain that the final α of ἀλλά was elided here: in 19 (δὲ ἐπὶ) *scriptio plena* is written. However, elision might be expected in quotations of poetry. That he did so here (and also in 26, where

see note) is suggested by space, judged from the supplements in 25 and 28, which seem certain and require 7–8 letters to fill the lacuna.

28 ὁ Κολεός. Cf. on 15. After ἀπεμάξατο, *AP* ix 507 and Achilles *De Arati vita* 5 Di Maria (= *Vit.* 1 66 Martin) go on here to give the remaining lines 3–4 of Callimachus, *Ephigr.* 27 Pf. χαίρετε λεπταί / ῥήσεις, Ἀρήτου κύμβολον ἀγρυσπνίης, whereas the author of the papyrus text omits them. Apparently Callimachus' pun in ἀγρυσπνίης (needed by Aratus as much for observation of the stars as for the studied polish of his style) was lost on him. Cf. the quotation of Aesch. *Agam.* 4–6 abbreviated at 31–3.

29 ῥήσιν suits the space better than e.g. παροιμίαν, but φράσιν or γνώμην e.g. might have stood here.

δικαίως ἂν τις εἴποι: parenthetical.

εἴποι. The optative is literary and rhetorical, as are the expression μὴ γ[νώσεως τοῦ]των ὀρφανῆν and the author's practice of citing authorities alternatively by their names and civic ethnics in *variatio*.

30 τοῦ]των: sc. the star signs discussed above; there will not be sufficient space for τοιοῦ]των; but εἶδ[ό]των or μαθη]τῶν ('bereft of hearers') might be considered.

ὀρφανῆν: sc. ῥήσιν (restored in 29), i.e. the statement that follows. For ὀρφανῆ in the metaphorical sense see LSJ s.v. II 2, citing Plato, *Alc.* II 147a ὀρφανὸς ὢν ταύτης τῆς ἐπιστήμης; Herod. 3. 38 ὀρφανῆ βίον; in verse: Pi. I. 4. 26 ὀρφανοὶ ὕβριος; Diosc. *AP* 12. 42 ὀρφανὸς ἀγκίστρον κάλαμος. A grammarian or commentator would hardly introduce a quotation in this way, suggestive of the style of a ῥήτωρ or σοφιστής writing in a declamatory mode rather than a philosopher or grammarian compiling notes in the form of a ὑπόμνημα.

ὁ Ἐλευσεῖνιο[ς: viz. Aeschylus. See on 15.

31–3 Aesch., *Agam.* 4–5, quoted by Achilles, *De universo* 1,1–2 Di Maria (= p. 28,14–16 Maass).

32–3 θέρος, on grounds of space, with MSS Aesch. M V G (θέρος βροτοῖς): βροτοῖς θέρος F G Tr. The papyrus is now the earliest witness for this order.

33 Before ὁδε there is left unscribed blank space of at least one letter. We might have expected the author to complete the quotation of the line with βροτοῖς, and also to quote the following line λαμπροὺς δυνάστας, ἐμπρέποντας αἰθέρι in order to fully illustrate his point: so Achilles, *De universo* 1,1–2 Di Maria (= p. 28,13–16 Maass), quotes all three lines in full (see below). In spite of his rhetorical introduction of the quotation of Aeschylus at 28–30, the author abbreviates the quotation of Aeschylus here, as indeed he did that of Callim. *Ephigr.* 27 Pf. at 25–8, of which he quotes not quite three out of its four lines.

Σοφοκλέους Νᾶ[ύπλιος. Probably *Nauplius* *TGrF* IV 432, quoted by Achilles, *De universo* 1,1–2 Di Maria (= p. 28,1–11 Maass). At line-end we might restore e.g. να[υτικά (cf. 15–16) sc. σημεῖα or some other word having to do with sailors or sailing and dependence upon star-signs. Achilles, *De universo* 1,1–2 Di Maria (= p. 28,12–16 Maass), immediately after quoting *Agam.* 4–6, continues with the quotation of an unknown play of Sophocles: Σοφοκλῆς δὲ εἰς Ἀτρεά τὴν εὔρεσιν ἀναφέρει λέγων: “κἀνταῦθα (. . .) / πᾶς προσκυνεῖ δὲ τὸν στρέφοντα κύκλον ἡλίου” (*TGrF* IV 738). It is tempting to think that this quotation from Sophocles was the one that stood here in the present text. However, Achilles (loc. cit.) has just finished quoting another fragment of Sophocles to the same end, the long speech from his *Nauplius*: Σοφοκλῆς δὲ Παλαμήδει ἀνατίθην· λέγοντα γὰρ Ναύπλιον εἰσάγει [quotes Soph. *Naupl.* *TGrF* IV 432]. Since Achilles introduces the quotation by saying that Nauplius himself actually speaks these words, and given the traces να[in 33, it is reasonable to restore this line as ὁ δὲ Σοφοκλέους Νᾶ[ύπλιος (e.g. φησὶν) followed by *TGrF* IV 432, spoken by that character. In Achilles, this quotation extends to a full eleven iambic lines, in which Nauplius expatiates on the value of star-signs. Given the author's observed tendency to abbreviate quotations elsewhere in the fragment, it seems perhaps doubtful that he would have quoted the passage in full (although he may have abbreviated it, as he does elsewhere: see above on 33). Cf. Maass, *Commentariorum*, p. 650 s.v. Sophocles.

4649. PROSE QUOTING HESIOD, *THEOGONIA* 6–7 (OR 8?)

83/96(a)

2.0 × 1.9 cm (fr. 1)

Third century
Plate IV

Two scraps of five and four line-beginnings each written along the fibres. Fr. 2 shows lines 6–7 (and possibly part of 8) of *Theogonia* written as prose. The back is blank. Paragraphi are present after fr. 1.3 and again after fr. 2.4. Length of lines is 18–22 letters (reconstructed on the basis of the quotation in fr. 2). Neither fragment preserves any margin; but to judge from the remnants of paragraphi, fr. 2 preserves line-beginnings and fr. 1 line-beginnings or very nearly. Thus the two fragments could be placed in vertical alignment, and a plausible interpretation of their content (see on fr. 1.4) would suggest that fr. 2 followed fr. 1 quite closely. However, they do not join physically:]φηε[fr. 1.5 cannot be placed to form part of]φη[. .]ν fr. 2.1.

The hand is a sloping version of the Formal mixed type, written small but well spaced and carefully penned. α is of the angular type; ε is of the same size and shape of ο (only slightly smaller than the other letters); ϵ is taller and narrow, with a flat back. μ has a shallow saddle, but ω has a full rise in its centre, suggesting a date at the end of the second or in the early third century. It compares well with XX 2256 (Aeschylus, commentary on various plays) = *GMAW*² 25, assigned to the late second or early third century. Punctuation is by paragraphus with no space or point (fr. 1.3 at end of prose sentence; fr. 2.4 at end of quotation?). There are no accents or other lectional signs and no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written.

The content of the two fragments taken together, namely a quotation of *Theog.* plus possible references to proximate verses (see on fr. 1.3–4) points to a commentary or prose discussion on the Hesiodic passage.

Vv. 6–7 of *Theog.* are present in Π¹ (XVII 2090) Π² (Cairo, Egypt. Mus. inv. 47269) *a b k S B R Q*; v. 8 is present in Π² *a b k S B R Q*. As far as we can tell, the verses as they appear here show no variation from these witnesses.

Fr. 1

· · · · ·
 · · · · ·
 · · · · ·
 · · · · ·
 · · · · ·
 5 · · · · ·
 · · · · ·

Fr. 2

.] φη[ci]ν “η [Iππου κρηνης η] Ολμειου [ζαθειοιο / ακροτα-] τωι Ελικ[ωνι χορους ενεποιη-] <u>σαντο</u> / κα[λους ιμεροεντας”? .	<i>Theog.</i> 6–7 <i>Theog.</i> 8?
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

Fr. 1

1 After *παρ* at base-line there is the tip of the nose of *λ* or possibly foot of the slanting upright of *ι* or *η*.

3 Under *c* (only the top is preserved) is the end of a paragraphus. If it was as long as in fr. 2, there should be room for at least one letter (and alignment with *π* fr. 1.4 suggests only one) to the left, thus effectively ruling out *Μού]cas*, the subject of the verses from *Theog.* quoted in fr. 2.

4 Perhaps ἐ]πὶ τοῦ Περ[μηρσοῦ. If correct, this could be a comment on *Theog.* 5 Περμηρσοῖο, suggesting that fr. 1 more or less immediately precedes fr. 2, which goes on to deal with *Theog.* 6f. It may be relevant that Περμηρσ[οῖο is read by *P² a: Τερμηρσ(σ)οῖο* by *b Q Laur. conv. sopp. 15* (West's V) and Zenodotus according to the scholia.

5 After *c* there is just a trace at the base-line, compatible with the bottom of *ι*, the angular base of *ε*, or the nose of *λ*, so that ε]φησ- and much else could be thought of.

Fr. 2

1] φη[ci]ν: Alignment of this word with the beginnings of lines 2–4 shows that the lines carrying quoted words were not set out in ekthesis. The length of the quotation (at least two full hexameters, possibly more) suggests a prose discussion rather than a lemma followed by comment. The scholia comment on the location of 'Ολμειοῦ, but not on 'Iππου κρήνης in v. 6 or anything in vv. 7–8.

4 The quotation may have ended with the pause at the end of v. 7 ἐνεποιήσαντο, and continued with a prose sentence beginning καί. But it is equally possible that the quotation ran to v. 8 καλοῦς ἰμερόεντας, another natural pause, bringing us to line-end (judged by the line-length of the preceding two lines).

D. OBBINK

4650. PROSE (?) QUOTING HESIOD, THEOGONIA 218–19(?)

103/106(c)

1.4 × 9.1 cm

Second half of second century
Plate VII

A narrow strip from a papyrus roll with 21 lines written across the fibres. The back is blank. In the course of the text appear line-beginnings, apparently aligned, from *Theogony*, followed perhaps by commentary or discussion. With the exception of 1 and 7 (see notes), the other lines are not obviously alignable as line-beginnings. If *Theog.* 218–19 were set out as undivided hexameters, the other lines must have had in the range of 36–39 letters.

The hand is a small round semi-cursive book-hand of the second century, closely written and spaced, of the sort not infrequently found in hypomnemata. ο has the same height as the other letters. ω has a fully raised centre, and μ a very low saddle almost in

four strokes. In 4 the tongue of ε protrudes beyond its body, but does not quite connect with the following κ.

The type of text is uncertain, but it contained other mythological entities (see 1) in addition to those of *Theog.* 218–19. One possibility is a commentary or prose discussion of Hesiod, with his mythology or eschatology as a topic. An anthology of excerpts such as that at Stob. *Ecl.* 1.5.5 (who quotes *Theog.* 217–19) is not to be ruled out, but I have not succeeded in identifying other quotations in the surrounding lines here. One could construct a fantasy around an account of the afterlife, with Kerber-, 4 ν]εκρω- and the Fates, even Styx (see on 7). However, a prose text is less likely to have quoted verses colometrically, and the possibility remains that the lines are verses recycling bits of Hesiodic poetry.

]	Κ̄ερβε[ρ-	<i>Theog.</i> 311?
]	οκατ[
]	ον με[
]	εκρω . [
5]	κατοτο[
]	ν υπαρ[
]	μμε . [
	Κλ]	ωθω δ[ε	<i>Theog.</i> 218?
	γει]	νομε[νοικι	<i>Theog.</i> 219?
10]	νεικ . [
]	ομολ[
]	αιτον[
]	νχ[
]	ειενν[
15]	. [
]	θξ[
]	ο . [
]	α[
] [
20]	. . [
]	. . [

1 Κ̄: diagonal descending from mid-level to lower right, with a more upright stroke rising to the top-line from the same point, η (not otherwise exemplified in this hand) suggested; κ could be read, assuming both upper and lower legs at angles closer to the vertical than in 2; or β, assuming a less full bottom and no horizontal stroke at base-line as in the exemplified β later in the line 4 . . [: points of ink low in the line at left and right, compatible

with λ, λ, x 5]ca7o7o[: in both cases the left half of the tops of τ is missing, and ρ could be read, but spacing favours τ 6 ρ[: with tail curving forward, below the line, otherwise ε 7]: end of horizontal at mid-level, as ε 8]: upright, ι, η, κ 10]: α or λ 11]: end of high horizontal, τ? 12]: high horizontal resting on and over-reaching an upright: η or π? 13]: the first is a horizontal at mid-level and the foot of an upright, η suggested; the second appears to be an upright followed by a low rounded curve like the saddle of μ, perhaps with a connection stroke to the χ. But I would not rule out ψ. 15]: a high horizontal at mid-level; the remainder of the line is completely abraded 16 before θε a high horizontal followed by a negligible trace at level of the line (not εκ) 17–21 are badly abraded with only occasionally discernible traces

Above 1 there is sufficient space to observe ink if there had been another line above. Therefore we appear to have the top margin.

1 Κερβε[ρ-: The first letter not certain: also possible is βερβε[, e.g. βερβε[ριζ-, α a later synonym of βαττα-ρίζειν, 'stammer' or 'stutter', according to *Etymologicum Magnum* 191.35 Gaisford, which might be relevant in a discussion of e.g. the origin of divine names. Cerberus appears in Hesiod only at *Theog.* 311:

Κέρβερον ὠμηστήν, Ἴδιδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον

some part of which may have appeared here, possibly with commentary following. If so, the beginning of the next verse in Hesiod (312 *πεντηκοντακέφαλον*) shows that the quotation did not continue beyond this verse. If 8–9 below preserve the first word in the line (which is not certain), the expected leftward drift of the column allows that Κερβε[ρ- could have begun the line here. However, it is odd that comment on 311 should have preceded that on 218–19, which appear to be quoted at 8–9 below. Therefore one or the other may have been material from Hesiod quoted as part of the discussion of the other, or we could have non-commentary mythographic discussion with *Theog.* 218–19 quoted as part of it. Arguing in favour of a commentary of some sort is the possibility (allowed by layout in the papyrus) that the words there stand at the beginning of their verses, and so seem to show line-beginnings here.

7] μμε[: The letters and traces are compatible with] ξμμεν[αι as e.g. at *Theog.* 400 (of Styx) *αὐτὴν μὲν γὰρ ἔθηκε θεῶν μέγαν ἔμμεναι ὄρκον*. However, that verse could only have stood here if it were quoted as prose, against the apparent precedent of 218–19 below; i.e., if it was quoted in whole or part here, it did not stand in alignment with *Theog.* 218–19 apparently quoted in 8–9 (similar difficulties with the position of *ἔμμεναι* in Hes. fr. 235.2 and 323 M.–W.). At *Op.* 272 *ἔμμεναι* and at *Theog.* 610 *ἔμμενέε* stand at initial position in their verses, and could be so aligned here, but in both the words are followed by a syntactical break, and it is not easy to see why either verse would be quoted in the context, such as it is.

8–9 Alignment of letters one above the other suggests that we have Hesiod, *Theog.* 218–19 written colometrically (with δέ for τε in 218):

Κλωθὴ τε Λάχεσιν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον, αἶ τε βροτοῖσι
γενομένοισι διδοῦσιν ἔχειν ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε.

These verses are omitted by Stob. 1.3.38 (who quotes *Theog.* 217–22) and are often excised as spurious by editors, but are present in *Π*⁴ (P. Lond. Lit. 33), *o*, and codd. Δ ε of Stobaeus at 1.5.5 (a quotation of 217–19). They are repeated with some variance at 905–6 (where 906 fails to correspond with line 9 in the papyrus):

Κλωθὴ τε Λάχεσιν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον, αἶ τε διδοῦσι
θητοῖς ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχειν ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε.

Scul. 258, in a passage (258–63) often regarded as a later addition, begins with Κλωθὴ but continues καὶ Λάχεσιν *εφν ἐφέστασαν*. The scholia offer nothing on vv. 218–19. *Theog.* 218 *Κλωθὴ τε Λάχεσιν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον* is quoted by Σ Pi. *O.* 7.118, but the comment there has no correspondence with the surrounding letters in the papyrus text. If *Theog.* 218–19 were quoted here, followed by prose commentary, we might have expected them to have stood in ekthesis as a lemma. It is not easy to see how discussion of Cerberus could be immediately related to that of Clotho: perhaps as descendants from the earliest generation of gods? Or mythological entities connected with death?

8 δ[ε: τε Π⁴ a b k S B R Q

9 Or γι[νομε]νοι, with MSS of Stobaeus?

D. OBBINK

4651. PROSE QUOTING HESIOD, *OPERA ET DIES* 219–23

68 6B.25/E(1–2)(a)

2.2 × 4.8 cm.

Third century
Plate VI

Scrap with beginnings of nine lines written along the fibres in a good small hand reminiscent of the Formal mixed type but with much connection (note especially 3 λι, 4 θρ and 5 δω, all reminiscent of documentary hands), and sloping to the right. Two different forms of α are written, one angular (e.g. 2, 3, 5) and another with rounded bowl (8). There are no surviving lectional signs or punctuation, and no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written. The back is blank.

Beginning in the middle of line 2 *Op.* 219–23 are written as prose, i.e. without observing verse colometry. (Colometric divisions, not marked in the papyrus text, are indicated by slashes (/) in the text below.) Apparently a quotation here, the lines after 2 are not marked as such by being written in ekthesis. But the first letter of the first word quoted (2 α[ντικα = *Op.* 219) appears enlarged and is preceded by an unscripted letter-space.

The quotation of Hesiod in 2–7 overlaps with *Π*⁸ (P. Gen. inv. 94).

.

μ εν . . [

γ ο α [ν τ ι κ α γ α ρ τ ρ ε χ ε ι Ο ρ κ ο ς α *Op.* 219–?223

μ α σ κ ο λ η γ [ι σ ι δ ι κ η σ ι ν / τ η ς δ ε Δ ι κ η ς

ρ ο θ ο ς ε λ κ ο [μ ε ν η ς η ι κ α ν δ ρ ε ς α γ ω σ ι ν /

5 δ ω ρ ο φ α γ [ο ι σ κ ο λ η σ ι ς δ ε δ ι κ η σ ι ς κ ρ ι

ν ω σ ι θ ε [μ ι σ τ α ς / η δ ε π ε τ α ι κ λ α ι ο υ

σ α] π ο λ ι ν [κ α ι η θ ε α λ α ω ν / η ε ρ α ε σ σ α

μ ε] ν η κ α [κ ο ν α ν θ ρ ω π ο ι σ ι φ ε ρ ο υ σ α /

σ . 4] . . . [

.

2 not ε̄]γγω (*Op.* 218). The letter before α is perhaps ν.

3 (= *Op.* 219) The writer seems to have first written κκα-, perhaps just a slip, which he then corrected to κκο-. But for the letter shape cf. the form of α (with rounded bowl) in 8. *Op.* 220–1 are quoted by *Etymologicum Genuinum* s.v. *ρόθος*.

4 (= *Op.* 220) ηι: sc. ῆ, with *Π*⁸ Proclus ο: ῆν Et. Gen. cod. A: ᾱ Fick. The reading of the papyrus here is unknown.

5 (= *Op.* 221) δωροφαγ[οι: βασιλείς are δωροφάγοι, οἱ τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλουσι δικάσαι at *Op.* 39, and also at 264 δωροφάγοι, σκολιέων δὲ δικέων ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθεσθε. *Op.* 219–24 might have been quoted as part of a commentary

on one or another of those occurrences of *δωροφάγος*, or from e.g. a treatise on kingship. Alternatively, one might think of the passage quoted as the major lemma to a commentary on either of these lines.

7 (= *Op.* 222) [και: with *o* on grounds of space: *τε και* Tr.

7–8 *Op.* 223 was condemned by Hetzel, *De carminibus Hesiodi* (1860), and by P. Mazon, *RÉA* 14 (1912) 342 n. 1, on account of the confusion of images, while West ad loc. argues that it is necessary to the sense because of the mention of punishment and ‘because 224 refers to the magistrates, whereas the *λαοί* of 222 are the whole population affected by their conduct’. The papyrus attests a text of *Op.* in which vv. 7–8 were present.

9 The surface is badly abraded, but there appear to be traces of more than stray ink: perhaps *εγγ*, e.g. *γ]γγ[εσαι*. This, however, is difficult to reconcile with the beginning of the next verse (224) *οὐτέ μιν ἐξελάσσει* (or *-άσσει* or *-άουσι* or *-άωσι*) in the text of Hesiod (the papyrus may have had room for *οι* at the end of 8). To reach a sense-break the quotation would need to continue to the end of this verse (*και οὐκ ἰθείαν ἔνευμαν*).

After this line there is about a line’s width of blank space on the papyrus, but it is not possible to tell whether another line of writing, now worn away, stood here or rather the bottom margin.

D. OBBINK

4652. GLOSSARY TO HESIOD, *SCUTUM* 243, 245, 308, 387(?), 389

95/68(a)

15 × 5.6 cm

Fifth century
Plates II, III

A parchment bifolium, preserving in brown ink the final five lines from the bottom of a column on two pairs of successive pages. The parchment is ruled along the lines of writing and up and down at left and right margins with a sharp, possibly inked, stylus. The fourth page is ruled but was possibly not written. There are binding holes visible along the center-fold. Written as lemmata in ekthesis are words from the Hesiodic *Scutum* followed by glosses. The lemmata are separated from their paraphrases by a midpoint (sometimes dicolon) and space of 1–2 letters. Individual glosses are closed by a dicolon, after which the remainder of line is left blank (in fol. 3,4). The list of glosses is written in exceedingly narrow columns consisting of short lines of 13–14 letters (from point of ekthesis as bounded by the vertical guide lines: see fol. 3,3 and 5). Ekthesis 0.35 cm (c.1 letter). Given the narrow width of columns (5.45 cm) and the fact that 63 lines of the poem must have been covered in the single column between fol. 1 and 2 if the codex had only one column per page, it is reasonable to conclude that there were at least two columns per page. Thus between fol. 1 col. i (inside column) and fol. 2 col. ii (inside column) there will have been at least 2 columns (plus the remainder of a third) covering 60 verses (*Scut.* 246–307); and between fol. 2 col. ii (inside column) and fol. 3 col. i (inside column) at least one bifolium (8 columns), in which 80 verses were covered (*Scut.* 309–87). Between fol. 3 col. i (inside column) and fol. 4 (inside column) there will have been 2 columns (plus the remainder of a third). The final column was not written (see note), at any rate in its final 5 lines as preserved. If the glossary ended before this point, 90 verses of the poem (*Scut.* 390–480) would have had to be covered in this intervening space in order to reach the the point (v. 480) at which it ends (with Ceyx) in the medieval MSS. The possibility remains that the glosses to *Scutum* were preceded in

the codex by glosses of similar type to Hesiod's *Theogonia* and *Opera et dies*, since these three works are known to have circulated together in the same codex at this date: so Π^3 (fourth–fifth century papyrus codex), Π^5 (fourth century parchment codex), and already Π^{19} (first century papyrus roll); M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 75–8.

The glossary is written in an upright formal majuscule of the ‘biblical’ type, characterised by heavy shading in vertical strokes and hairline horizontals (angle of writing sometimes about 25 degrees, sometimes close to horizontal), suitable for the fifth century: for a comparable script see P. Berol. 16353 (*GBEPP* 24b, LXX Genesis), late fifth century (assigned). The present script shows some affinities with the later version in which the angle of writing is zero and horizontal strokes are written so threadlike as to disappear completely, e.g. P. Berol. 6794 (*GBEPP* 25a, H. *Il.* XXI and XXII) fifth/sixth century (assigned). The present script retains some of the fluid simplicity associated with the earlier examples, and horizontal strokes of Δ and π are not yet drawn out and decorated with knobs as in the later versions: cf. XIII 1621 (pl. V; *GBEPP* 13b, Speeches from Thucydides Book II) of the second half of the fourth century (not later than cursive corrections datable to 340–370). The present script, however, shows less balance in thickness of strokes. μ in four strokes to mid-level (not deep, as in *GBEPP* 24b). The writing is bilinear except for ρ , τ , γ , and notably χ . Note vertical decorative strokes on the beginning but not end of cross-bar of τ , finials on top of upright of κ , but otherwise little decoration.

The simplicity of the glosses, mere paraphrase or single-word equivalents, suggests a rather elementary glossary, in the nature of a word-list as a reader's aid: e.g. fol. 2 col. i (hair side), 4–5. A number of the glosses appear to comment on what can only be erroneously transmitted readings as lemmata: fol. 1 col. i (flesh side), 2, 4–5(?).

In some cases there is a direct connection with the surviving medieval scholia, ed. C. F. Ranke, *Hesiodi quod fertur Scutum Herculis* (Quedlinburgi et Lipsiae 1840), which prints line-by-line scholia and a paraphrase. In some cases these suggest possibilities of reconstruction, as noted below. On the ancient tradition of scholia to *Scut.* see C. F. Russo, *Hesiodi Scutum*, 2nd ed. (Florence 1965) 52–7. It is difficult to see how ‘old scholia’ should be distinguished from Byzantine ones, apart from those with names of ancient scholars attached to them or which have close parallels in ancient *etymologica* (R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig 1897) 47 and 50 n. 1). 4652 provides some additional comparanda.

Collation of readings of the glosses from text of *Scut.* has been with the editions of C. F. Russo, *Hesiodi Scutum*, 2nd ed. (Florence 1965) and the OCT edition of F. Solmsen, *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum* (Oxford 1970). Lemmata from the text of the poem, indicated by ekthesis and diacriticals in the parchment, are printed in bold type.

fol. 1 col. i (flesh side, inside column)

. [
βωω κατ[- c.6–8

(243)

ναι δε η[c.6

γῆραι τε μεμ[αρ- (245)

5 **πον:** μεμα[ρ- c.4

fol. 2 col. i (hair side, inside column)

.
]υπρο

c.6]σαντες: (308?)

c.6] . . : εψοφο.υ

επικ]ροτεοντα: ε- (308)

5 **πι]κροτουντα:**

fol. 3, col. i (hair side, inside column)

.
.[

εχων. . [c.7 (387?)

δοχμωθεις πλ[α- 2-3 (389)

γιασας: vac.

5 **μαστιχωωντι: τρι** (389)

fol. 4, col. 2 (flesh side, inside column)

.
].

(lines 2-5 ruled but not written)

fol. 1 col. i (flesh side, inside column)

1 . [: Base of an upright, as of 1, γ in ekthesis detruding from the line above 2.

2 **βοω κατ[-**: βόων b S B A J F Z R, sc. *Scut.* 243 χαλκέων δξὺ βόων, κατὰ δ' ἐδρύπτοντο παρειάς. This appears to be a lemma or part of one begun in the line above (thus both in ekthesis). Above ω there is no stroke of abbreviation of final -ν visible; presumably we should correct to βόω(ν) with the MSS. If κατ- is part of the lemma (there is no dicolon before it), then space would allow no more than κατ[ὰ δ', since we have to allow for the beginning of the word which ends -ναι in the next line. Yet it seems extraordinary to break the sense at that point in the thesis. Perhaps κατ[should be taken as beginning the gloss (assuming omission of dicolon). If so, κατ[c. 4-6 -με]ναι δέ η[. To judge from Σ and Paraphr. one might expect explanation of ἐνδμήτων, χαλκέων, βόων, ἐδρύπτοντο. If βόων is the lemma, one might think of e.g. κατ[ακραγόμε]ναι. Hesych. i 332 Latte s.v. βοᾶ gives κραυγάζει.

4 **γῆραι τε** (i.e. γήρα τε?): γήρα τε B: γήρας τε b S A J F Z R (and printed by Solmsen). Σ p. 34 Ranke τὸ γήρας κατέλαβον. γρ. γήρα τε μέμαρται (M: μεμάραται A), ἤγουν μεμάρανται ὑπὸ τοῦ γήρωσ suggests that the dative read in the text-lemma may have originated from an explanatory gloss.

4-5 **μεμ[αρ]πον:** with J R L S Σ^Z: μέμαρπεν F (printed by Solmsen): -πτεν Σ: -πτο m: -πτων B: -πτον ΣΣ^Z. As in the scholia, the gloss may have been μεμά[ρανται (space?) and may have gone on to explain γήρα by ὑπὸ τοῦ γήρωσ or the like (cf. Hesych. ii 630 Latte s.v. μάρπτεν· κατέλάμβανε, συνελάμβανε). But, unlike Σ, the text

presupposed by the glossary took ‘the men’ (ἄνδρες) to continue as subject (not object) of the verb and ‘old age’ to be (indirect) object, not subject. With the text-lemma γήρη we should have expected the continuation μεμέρανται, not μέμαρπον.

fol. 2 col. i (hair side, inside column)

2]σαντες should relate to *Scut.* 308 (beginning) ῥντὰ χαλαίνοντες: Σ p. 36 Ranke τὰ χαλινὰ χαλάσαντες, which might be restored in the parchment.

3] . . : base of upright, followed by two diagonals as legs of of λ, λ, x connecting to upright at lower right, so that n could also be read. In one way, one would think of 309 (end) and read ἀτέ]νν:, followed by gloss ἐψόφονν (after φ there is a rounded letter, and then a diagonal connecting to an upright at bottom; between them is possibly the vestige of an upright compatible with γ if the writing is compressed at line-end). But that would mean that the glosses were in the wrong order. *Etymologicum Magnum* 171.28 Gaisford has ἀτένν: ἐφώνησε, προσεκαλείτο. Hesych. i 283 Latte s.v. ἀτένν gives ἐφώνουν, ἐβόων.

4-5 επικ]ροτεοντα: ε[|πικ]ροτουντα: The gloss consists of the simple contracted form, complete in itself (as shown by the diacriticals), which suggests a rather elementary set of explanations.

fol. 3, col. i (hair side, inside column)

1 .[: Nose of λ or left leg of λ, x, not obviously in ekthesis.

2 εχων .[: This should be part of the explanation of *Scut.* 387 χαυλιόδων: Paraphr. p. 64 Ranke . . . κεχαλασμένους ἔχον τοὺς ὀδόντας, which could be partly read and partly restored here: after εχων there are exiguous traces on the edge at the level of the base-line: perhaps bottom of upright in centre of full letter-space suitable for τ, followed possibly by a trace of ink at the base-line in the centre of the letter-space. So also Hesych. iv 276 Schmidt s.v. χαυλιόδοντα: τὸν ἐπικεχαλασμένους ἔχοντα τοὺς ὀδόντας ἔξω τῶν ἄλλων ὀδόντων καὶ τοῦ στόματος. οἱ δὲ ἀμφόδοντα.

3-4 πλ[α]|γιασας (i.e. πλ[α]|γιασας). π consists of bases of two uprights. The following trace is the foot of an upright or diagonal descending slightly below the baseline, p suggested, but λ not excluded, so that πλ[a]- may be read. This relates to *Scut.* 389 δοχμωθεῖς: Σ give no explanation of 389, but Paraphr. p. 64 Ranke gives δοχμωθεῖς καὶ πλαγίως στραφεῖς and in other scholia (see p. 269 Ranke) δόχμια is glossed as πλάγια: *Etymologicum Magnum* 285. 13 Gaisford, for example, has δόχμιος· ὁ πλάγιος. Hesych. i 475 Latte s.v. δόχμια gives πλάγια, λοζά, κεκαμμένα.

5 A completely preserved line (at 15 letters), giving lemma and beginning of gloss for 389 μαστιχόωντι. But τρι (or possibly πι, but the second upright descends below the base-line) remains deeply mysterious. One is left only to guess at corruptions of e.g. πρι[οντι (which would at least suit the sense), πτυ[οντι (as in Paraphr. p. 64 Ranke ἀφρὸς δὲ περὶ τὸ στόμα στάζεται αὐτῷ κινούντι τὸ αὐτοῦ στόμα δίκην ἀνθρώπου μασσωμένου καὶ κυχνῶς πτύοντος on *Scut.* 389 ἀφρὸς δὲ περὶ στόμα μαστιχόωντι), or τυπ[τοντι: cf. Hesych. ii 632 Latte s.v. μαστίζει· πληγαῖς τύπτει.

fol. 4, col. 2 (flesh side, inside column)

Apart from the possible trace of the foot of an upright at the end of line 1, only linings (both horizontal and vertical) are visible. This remainder of the space (bottom of a column like the other folia) does not seem to have ever been written; there is no indication that writing has faded or been washed away. In the intervening space between fol. 3 col. i (inside column) and fol. 4 (inside column) consisting of at least 2 columns (plus the remainder of a third), 90 verses of the poem (*Scut.* 390–480) must have been covered in order to reach the point (v. 480) at which it ends (with Ceyx) in the medieval MSS. This would be less space devoted to the poem than elsewhere in the glossary (see introduction); perhaps the text of *Scut.* used for the glossary ended before v. 480, or the glosses did not continue to the point at which *Scut.* ends in the medieval MSS. At any rate, the text of *Scut.* glossed by the parchment does not seem to have continued on past v. 480, the end of *Scut.* in the MSS to have included explanations of words from possible continuations of the poem such as the *Marriage of Ceyx* or other *Ehoiai*.

II. KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

4653–4666. HESIOD, *THEOGONIA*, *OPERA ET DIES*, *SCUTUM*

Under these numbers we give the remainder of the papyri of Hesiod's *Theogonia*, *Opera et dies*, and the Hesiodic *Scutum* identified thus far in the holdings of the Egypt Exploration Society (cf. XXXII 2638–51, XLV 3220–32 among others). These papyri have not been used previously in collation or constitution of critical editions of Hesiod. Here and there they supply now better and now worse readings than the medieval tradition, some of the expected variants as well as some new ones, together with some viable but not certainly correct readings. In some crucial passages they give no help, or add new errors. Their most important contributions are the omission (in 4660) of *Op.* 93 and 99, the first in agreement with one group of medieval MSS, the second likewise omitted by Plutarch. The same papyrus adds a unique variant at *Op.* 100, but includes without further notice 104, condemned by some ancient critics according to the *Scholia vetera*. 4661 includes *Op.* 563, athetized by Plutarch in his commentary and not represented in the *Scholia vetera*. 4656 gives a correct orthography in *Theog.* 675 against most of the medieval tradition, while 4664 in *Scut.* 93 and 4665 in 222 give a correct reading, siding with the same side of the medieval tradition (B J F Z) against another (*b S*). Not surprisingly, they include a number of verses suspected by modern editors, including *Theog.* 564, 744–5, and 826–9 (the last in the order of the medieval MSS against that of a previously published papyrus). At the same time, 4666 omits *Scut.* 259, often suspected (together with its surrounding verses) by editors.

Among the new items, a second-century papyrus roll (4659) gives the first column and the earliest preserved portion of *Op.* (no papyrus yet preserves its opening verses). 4663 preserves the first end-title of *Op.* from a papyrus roll. 4655 and 4660 are from manuscripts of Hesiod of relatively early date as papyri of Hesiod go, and for Oxyrhynchus (first century BC–first century AD), while 4656 and 4664 are not much later. 4654 and 4660–1 preserve parts of *Theog.* and *Op.* not previously attested on papyri (cf. 4650 8–9); none of the verses covered by the three new papyri of *Scut.* (4664–6) were known previously on papyri. 4653 forms part of a papyrus roll containing *Theog.* already published (XXXII 2648). 4666 is another copy of *Scut.* written by the same scribe who produced PSI IX 1087. Several overlap with previously published papyri (4653, 4655–7, 4662; cf. 4648 17, 19, 4649 ii; 4651), offering an opportunity for collation of ancient witnesses. Some (4653, 4655, 4657, 4659–60, 4662, and 4664) provide examples of accented MSS of the poems. 4659–60 employ critical signs in the margin to mark the point of insertion of omitted verses. 4659 adds a new example of the use of marginal περιγραφαί to signal trouble or mark deletion. Cf. 4648–51 above, which preserve prose quotations of *Theog.* and *Op.*, augmenting the body of ancient citations of Hesiod, as do the lemmata of 4652, the first ancient MS (fifth century) of scholia to *Scut.*

All of the new items are papyrus rolls, dating from the first century BC to the third century AD. At least some of these may have contained more than one poem of Hesiod's (although no further identities with published fragments have been discovered). This seems likely in particular with the fragments of *Scut.*, complete in the medieval MSS in only 480 verses. By the fourth–fifth centuries it is common enough for the three poems (*Theog.*, *Op.*, and *Scut.*) to circulate in the same codex: so Π^3 and Π^5 , while already Π^{19} , a first-century opisthograph papyrus roll, contained these three poems and possibly also the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 75–8). The relation (both in composition and transmission) of the *Catalogue to Scut.* (which begins in Π^5 and the medieval MSS with the *Ehoia* of Alcmena; cf. XXIII 2355 + XXVIII 2494A = *Cat.* fr. 195 M.–W.) is discussed by M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985) 70 n. 93, 136, and by P. Dräger, *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods*, Palingenesia 61 (Stuttgart 1997).

Collation has been with, and missing portions of text supplied exempli gratia (for the purpose of illustrating spacing and format, wherever space and readings from the papyrus do not tell against the printed text) from, the following editions: for *Theog.*: the OCT edition of F. Solmsen, *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum* (Oxford 1970); for *Op.*: M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978); for *Scut.*: the edition of Solmsen (cit.). The critical sigla used for the reporting of medieval witnesses in these editions have been adopted. In restored portions of the text, subscript iotas in the modern editions have been replaced with adscript ones, except in papyri where it is known to be the scribe's convention to omit them, in which cases the modern editors' iota subscripts have been eliminated. Missing left-hand portions of columns have been supplied as illustrative of spacing wherever it can be estimated to coincide with the layout of the remains as preserved, but not missing right-hand portions, where spacing can be less closely estimated.

For published papyri of these works see the on-line edition of the catalogue of Mertens–Pack³ at <http://www.ulg.ac.be/facphl/services/cedopal/MP3/fexp.shtml>, and the *Lewen Database of Ancient Books* at <http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/>. For reporting these we have used the system of numbering begun by Jacoby in his edition of *Theog.* and continued in those of West and Solmsen; subsequently published papyri are reported by standard conventions.

For reports of readings from medieval MSS we have also made use of the following editions: for *Theog.*, *Op.*, and *Scut.*: G. F. Schoemann, *Hesiodi quae feruntur carminum reliquiae* (Berlin 1869), F. A. Paley, *The Epics of Hesiod* (London 1883), A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina*, ed. maior (Leipzig 1902) and 3rd ed. min. (Leipzig 1913), and F. Solmsen (cit.); for *Theog.*: W. Aly, *Hesiods Theogonie* (Heidelberg 1913), F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin 1930), and M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966); for *Op.*: T. A. Sinclair, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (London 1932), A. Colonna, *Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Milan 1968), and Solmsen (cit.); for *Scut.*: C. F. Russo, *Hesiodi Scutum*, 2nd ed. (Florence 1965). Reference to the fragments of the *Catalogus* is to the editio maior of R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967), supplemented by the 3rd abridged edition of their editio minor included in the 1990 reprint of Solmsen's OCT edition of Hesiod.

For a survey of ancient and medieval scholarship on Hesiod, see West's introd. to *Hesiod: Works and Days* (cit.) 63–71 plus bibliography on p. 91, and 72–8 on the text of *Op.* References to Scholia vetera to *Theog.* are to the edition of L. Di Gregorio, *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Theogonia* (Milan 1975); Scholia vetera to *Op.*: ed. A. Pertusi, *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et dies* (Milan 1955). For the commentaries of Proclus, Tzetzes, and Moschopulus: Th. Gaisford, *Poetae minores Graeci* ii (Oxford 1814; Leipzig 1923). For the fragments of Plutarch's commentary: F. H. Sandbach, *Plutarchi Moralia* vii (Leipzig 1967) fr. 25–57, 59–112. For the surviving medieval scholia to *Scut.* see **4652** introd.

For a summary of the medieval manuscripts of Hesiod, see H. Erbse in H. Hunger et al., *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung* i (Zurich 1968) 280–1; specifically for *Theog.* see M. L. West, *CQ* N.S. 14 (1964) 165–89, summarised in id. *Hesiod: Theogony* (cit.) 53–72; for those of *Op.* see M. L. West, *CQ* N.S. 24 (1974) 161–85, summarized in id. *Hesiod: Works and Days* (cit.) 78–86; for those of *Scut.* see F. H. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* (Oxford 1913) 238–40; Solmsen (OCT ed. cit.) pp. xxii–xxiii, xxv–xxvi. For citations of the text of *Theog.* and *Op.* by ancient authors see the discussions of West, *Hesiod: Theogony* pp. 67–9, id. *Hesiod: Works and Days* pp. 63–75, and the secondary apparatus to both editions.

D. OBBINK

4653. HESIOD, *THEOGONIA* 143?⁹–9, 411–20 (MORE OF XXXII **2648**)fr. 1: 60/12
fr. 2: 127/28 (part)

2 × 6.5 cm (fr. 2)

Early third century
Plate IV

Two fragments written along the fibres of a papyrus roll. Fr. 2 preserves a top margin to a height of 1.8 cm. On its back are two letters of cursive form seemingly written against the fibres, probably from a documentary text now badly abraded or washed out. The back of fr. 1 is blank. Its surface is darkened, particularly along the right edge.

The text is written in a smallish, closely written, sloping version of the Formal mixed type, leaning slightly to the right. The hand, linear spacing, and diacritical markup is identical to that of XXXII **2648** (pl. XV) = Π²⁹, which contains parts of 681–94 and 751–71, dated by its editor to early in the third century (fr. b there shows severe darkening of the surface, particularly at the right edge, similar to fr. 1 here). Presumably **4653** gives portions of lines at two different points earlier in the same roll. For the style of the writing compare XI **1365** (pl. VI; history of Sicyon), assigned to the first half of the third century ('accompanying document' carrying a date in 287), which is more slanting and closely written. A similar hand is VII **1016** (pl. V; Roberts, *GLH* 20a, Plato, *Phaedrus*) probably not written much before 235, the date of the tax-register VII **1044** on the front according to L. C. Youtie, *ZPE* 21 (1976) 9, though J. Rowlandson, *ZPE* 67 (1987) 290, undermines one of Mrs Youtie's arguments but agrees that '234/5 can still be regarded as a likely if not a secure date' for VII **1044**; similarly: D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 110 (1996) 160.

As in XXXII 2648 a variety of lectional signs are in evidence: high stop added later by the scribe himself or by a corrector serves to mark a pause within the period; acute accents, and at least two grave (414, 415). All are somewhat clumsily written with a sharp pen, occupying most of the space between the lines, probably an indication that the accents were placed after the text was written. Elision is effected but is not signalled in fr. 1 (414), but marked with apostrophe in XXXII 2648 (682, 685, 689). Diaereses mark an initial vowel in 417 and 419 (in the latter case while articulating the possible diphthong *av*), both apparently due to the original scribe. As in XXXII 2648, there is no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written.

Fr. 1 overlaps with Π¹ (XVII 2090) at 148–9, with Π³ (P. Achmim 3) at 143²–144, and with Π²¹ (XXXII 2640) at 142–9. Fr. 2 is the only papyrus so far to attest these lines. It shows no new readings, but witnesses several that are of interest.

Fr. 1

.

143?] [

144 Κυκλωπες δ ονομ ησαν επ]ώνυμ[-

145 κυκλοτερης οφθαλμος εις] ενεκειτο μ[ετωπωι
 ιχυς τ ηδε βιη και μηχα]ναί ησαν επ[
 αλλοι δ αυ Γαιης τε και Ουρα]νου εξεγγον[το
 τρεις παιδες μεγαλοι και ό]βριμοι ονκ ονο[μαστοι
 Κοττος τε Βριαρεως τε Γυγης θ υ]περη[φανα

.

Fr. 2

η δ υποκυσαμενη Ε]κάτην τ[εκε
 Ζευς Κρονιδης τιμη]σε' πόρ[εν
 μοιραν εχειν γαιης τ]ε και α[τρυγετοιο
 η δε και αστεροεντος] απ ουράν[ου
 415 αθανατοις τε θεοις . . .]μένη έστ[ι
 και γαρ νυν οτε που τις ε]πιχθονίω[ν
 ερδων ιερα καλα κατα νόμο]ν ιλ[ακηται
 κικλησκει Εκατην πολλ]η τέ οι έ[
 ρεια μαλ ω προφρων γε θεα] υποδεξ[ι
 420 και τε οι ολβον οπαζει επει δυναμι]ς γ[ε

.

Fr. 1

143?] [: In the MSS 143 ends μέσσω ένέκειτο μετώπω. Above the *υ* of *υμ* in 144 is a spiky tail, sloping to the left below the line with a slight curve, at a slightly sharper degree of angle than the acute accent on the

preceding syllable $\omega\nu$ in 144 (in the scribe's ink but not as finely drawn as the accent, which would in any case not be expected over $\nu\mu$ here), suggesting λ or possibly χ . Neither of these will conform to anything at this position in 143. The most likely possibility is that we have (i) a trace of ι in $\mu\epsilon\kappa\kappa\omega\iota$, descending below the line and assuming iota-adscript to have been written. ι elsewhere does not normally descend below the line of writing, and at the only place where it does so (v. 682 in XXXII 2648, where it is an initial iota with diaeresis) it does not stand at this angle (nor is the spacing as expected for $\mu\epsilon\kappa\kappa\omega\iota$). (ii) The descending trace might be taken as the left leg of λ (though it does not elsewhere descend in this way); the preceding traces are compatible with $\nu\alpha\lambda$ in 142 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\kappa\iota\omicron\iota$: the right side of λ can be seen to collide with the tail of λ at the level of the line, its nose fully visible at left; ν is the bottoms of two uprights; ϵ is but a point of ink at the level of the line. If so, the papyrus did not contain 143, but passed direct from 142 to 144. Solmsen removed 143 as a later addition: it is present in $\Pi^3 \Pi^{21}$ Σrec *a b k S B Q*, i.e. all MSS (see below for the testimony of Herodian). 144–5 were suspected as spurious and removed by Wolf. (iii) A third alternative would be to postulate a different word-order in 143 from the transmitted text, so that $\delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ will arrive at this position above 144 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ (read $\omicron]\phi\theta\alpha\lambda[\mu\omicron\varsigma$). Disruption here might be suggested by the variant reading of this line as quoted by Herodian vol. 2 p. 924. 29 Lentz, who, however, reads $\delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon} \acute{\epsilon}\iota\epsilon\varsigma$ (by contamination with 145), i.e. shifting the relevant word to the beginning of the line. In addition, there seems to be no trace of the descender of ϕ which could be expected to be visible above ν or the acute over ω .

144 $\epsilon\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\mu[-$: $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ $\Pi^3 a b k S B Q$ Porphyry in sch. *Od.* 9.106 (ed. H. H. L. Schrader, *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias* (Leipzig 1890) 85): $-\omicron\iota$ *Elym. Epimer.*: [Π^{21}].

145 $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron$: with *a b k S B Q Δ* and attested in the secondary tradition: $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron$ Par. 2678 (West), Theognostus: [Π^{21}].

146 $-\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\kappa\alpha\nu$: ι is written just above the line above $a\eta$, protruding only half way above the letters, probably by the scribe but after the line was written.

147 $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu[\tau\omicron$: with *a k L^{7p} R S B Q*: $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ $\acute{\xi}\xi m$ (according to Rzach): $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ L (mechanical repetition of a familiar verse-end?): [Π^{21}].

148 is present before 149 with $\Pi^1 \Pi^{21} a k S R Q L^1$ (in margin), correctly: omitted in L: 148 is written after 149 in *m*. After $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\iota$, $\tau\epsilon$ is added by Gerhard (and accepted by current editors), but as written in the papyrus the line did not have room for it: [Π^1] [Π^{21}].

$\omicron\nu\kappa$: with *a b k Q*: $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\iota}$ corrected from $\acute{\eta}\kappa$ (or $\acute{\eta}\delta$ from $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$) in S: $\acute{\eta}\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ U² (West): [Π^{21}].

Fr. 2

414 $\alpha\pi$: with *a b k S Q*: $\acute{\upsilon}\pi'$ Ald. For $\acute{\alpha}\pi'$ P. Maas, *Epidaurische Hymnen* (Halle 1933) 140 n. 2 compares *Od.* 5.40 $\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron} \lambda\eta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\iota\kappa\alpha\nu$.

$\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu[\omicron\nu$. The placing of the grave accent on the penultimate syllable here and in 415 $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\tau[\iota$ warn against placing of an acute on this syllable: see J. Moore-Blunt, *QUCC* 29 (1978) 137–63 at 146, whose examples are all of the second and third centuries; C. M. Mazucchi, *Aegyptus* 59 (1979) 145–167, with further bibliography.

415] $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$: $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ *a k S^{3c}* Parisinus 2772 (so Rzach) Florentinus Laurentianus 31.32 (so Rzach): $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ *b S^{3c} m^{3c}*: $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ *m^{3c}* Parisinus 2708 (according to Rzach). The rather large lacuna in the papyrus allows space for $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$, and tells against $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ and $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\tau[\iota$ (with grave accent) may be meant to exclude $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\tau\iota$ with a different meaning.

418 $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$: with *a b k S Q*: $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ Koechly (according to West). Compare Hes. fr. 141.18 M.–W. $\mu\omicron\lambda\lambda]\lambda\acute{\eta} \delta\acute{\epsilon} \omicron\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$. ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ may have stood in Tunstall's MS, as implied by the Latin translation in Birchman's edition: see West's introduction p. 63).

$\acute{\xi}$ [: $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron$ corrected in Tr: $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha$ *a b k S Q*: $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha$ Parisinus 2772 Florentinus Laurentianus 31.32. Above ϵ , the lower end of an oblique stroke descending from the right above ϵ is visible, apparently an acute accent rather than a sign of rough breathing (the latter not employed elsewhere in this papyrus or XXXII 2648).

419 $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ [: $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha$ *a k m S Q m* and apparently intended by L¹ ($\gamma\rho$. $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\omicron}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha$ sic): $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\tau\omicron$ Flor. Laur. 31.32 (Rzach's I): $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\tau\omicron$ L Tr. The far left edge of the lower stroke of α is visible.

M. SALEMENOU

4654. HESIOD, *THEOGONIA* 334–9

101/215(f)

6.5 × 2.7 cm

Third century

A small fragment from a roll containing vv. 334–9 written along the fibres in a medium-large hand. The back is blank. The script is a version of the Formal mixed type, written slowly but vigorously and with some attempt at stylization. It shows distinctly formed letter shapes, minimal connection between letters (cf. 335 αϷ), with a slight slant to the right. Horizontals and uprights are straight (tail of ρ and τ flare backwards at bottom), but diagonals show a tendency toward curvature: e.g. ν in μεν in 336 and α with tail finishing in a curve upward; ω with distinct rise to mid-level in the centre; but μ with shallow rounded saddle. ο is diminutive and floating between the lines. ε is of the tall and narrow type, with a straight back. The hand compares well with XXVII 2452 (pll. I–II; *GMAW*² 27, Sophocles?, *Theseus*) assigned to the third century (see p. 149 n. 48) and with XVII 2098 (pl. III; Roberts, *GLH* 19b, Herodotus VII) of the ‘first half’ of the third century’ (land survey of the reign of Gallienus on the back). The simplicity of the letter-shapes (e.g. α in 337) and the pronounced rise in the centre of ω, point to a date early in the third century. One acute accent is added (in 339), probably by the hand of the main text. In the two cases where we can judge, elision is effected and marked by apostrophe. There is no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written. The text as preserved shows no divergences from the medieval tradition.

This is the first papyrus of Hesiod to witness these lines.

. . . .

335 γε]ι[ν]ατ[ο
 πειραειν [
 τουτο μεν εκ [
 Τηθυς δ' Ωκεαν[ω
 Νειλον τ' Αλφειο[ν
 Cτρυμόνα Μαια[νδρον

337 δ': The top of the apostrophe survives in its topmost part, a dot of ink beneath ε in the line above.

338–9 are present in the papyrus. Bergk condemned 338–45 as spurious, while Jacoby (in his edition of *Theog.*) thought them foreign to Hesiod's style.

B. CURRIE

4655. HESIOD, *THEOGONIA* 549–58, 562(?)–7

102/51(b)

5.2 × 6.2 cm (fr. 1)

First century

Two fragments of a papyrus roll (possibly but not certainly from the same column), written along the fibres. Upper margin is preserved to a depth of 2.1 cm. A second hand has added accents and corrections with a different pen. The back is blank.

The hand is irregularly executed in a medium-sized Informal round capital, bilinear (only φ and ρ project below the line), with oddly curled, right-pointing serifs attached to the upper part of α (cf. 551, 553, 554), Δ (cf. 550, 551), μ and ν (cf. 554). α is triangular, written in three movements with a near horizontal cross-bar, and a nose which dips lower than its right-hand tail. ε is written in two movements with a detached mid-stroke; its separately placed flat top nearly joins the end of the mid-stroke (554). ι occasionally has a left-facing serif (cf. 551, 552, 554). μ in four strokes, its oblique sides and the central dip touching the line. ο is rounded and formed in two halves, slightly taller than wide (heart-shaped in 3). ς has a flat top. γ is a symmetrical cup on a short stem. ω in two movements. The diagonal of ν is near horizontal and meets the right upright just below its middle. Iota adscript is written wherever we expect it. Elision of final vowels is effected but not marked (one example: 550). Spacing of letters narrows in some lines (see 551), especially where letters are connected (551 *ce*, 552 *τα*, 554 *καμφ*). Punctuation (coinciding with weak pause) by medial point (550, 551, 554), placed in the course of writing the text, not afterwards as in the case of the accents and breathings. The odd decoration, some wildly divergent readings, and other oddities point to informal or private production, perhaps someone practising.

The hand compares well with XXXII **2654** + V **866** (pl. I; *GMAW*² 41), assigned to the first half of the first century. It also resembles II **246** (Roberts, *GLH* 10c, return of sheep) dated to AD 66 and XXXVII **2822** (pl. I; Hesiod, *Catalogue*), assigned to the late first/early second century. Some of its apparently archaizing features, such as z with upright middle (550), and ε with detached cross-bar, find parallels in documents of the later first century, for example XLV **3250** (pl. VIII, AD 63). For an accented copy of Hesiod with breathing marks in a similar yet more carefully executed hand see XXIII **2355** (pl. II, *Catalogue*), assigned to the late first/early second century.

A second hand made corrections (missing ν inserted above the line in 1, overwritten ρ and ε in 553 and 566), and added acute and grave accents and a breathing sign (Turner's form 3; *GMAW*² p. 11) in darker ink with a different pen.

In 566 (and 557) the text overlaps with PSI XI 1191 fr. a col. i 1–2 (+ XXXII **2639** = Π¹³). It gives a combination of correct, potentially correct, and incorrect readings. In 449 it does not support a conjecture by Paley, siding against S with the rest of the manuscript tradition. An omission by haplography in 552 is apparently left uncorrected. In 554 the papyrus may give the erroneous word-order that later appears in *m* S, against *a b k* and a correction by L, or it may have omitted a word here. In 555 the papyrus does not side with *a k m* and a correction in S in completing that line with what the other MSS give as

the end of 557. The papyrus gives 564, a line suspected by Paley and other editors as a later addition.

Fr. 1

των δ ελευ οππο]τερη'ν' σε ενι φρε[ci
 550 φη ρα δολοφρονε]ων· Ζε̅νς δ αφθι[τα
 γνω ρ ουδ ηγ]νοιησε δολον· κακα δ[
 θνητοις αν]θρώποισι τα και <τε>λε[εσθαι
 χερσι δ ο γ αμ]φοτέρησιw αν̅ε[λετο
 χωσατο δε φ]ρενας αμφι· δ[
 555 ως ιδεν οσtea λευκα] βοο[ε
 εκ του δ αθανατοις]ν[
 καιους οσtea λευκ]α θυ[ηεντων
 τον δε μεγ οχθησας] π[ροσεφη

.

Fr. 2

.
]·[
 ουκ εδιδου μελιησι] πυρος μ[ενοσ
 θνητοις ανθρωπ]οις `οι επι χθο[νι
 565 αλλα μιν εξαπατ]ησεν ευσ παις Ι[απετοιο
 κλεισας ακαματοιο πυρ]ος τηλέσ[κοπον
]·[

549 *ce*: with *abk* Q; *γe* S: *ce γ'* conjectured by Paley. The papyrus does not support Paley's conjecture, and raises *ce* to the status of an ancient variant.

550 *Zēn̅ς*. For contemporary parallels presenting barytonesis in oxytone words see C. M. Mazzucchi, *Aegyptus* 59 (1979) 157–8; J. Moore-Blunt, *QUCC* 29 (1978) 155.

552 After *και*, traces of two oblique strokes, the first of which suggests λ, but when combined with the second (trace of diagonal and horizontal ink at level of the line) could form μ (*λα* is less likely). τ cannot be read. No variant readings are reported. In accord with the tradition, *και <τε>λε[εσθαι]* may be suspected.

553 *αν̅ε[λετο*: ξ is the upper left arc of a circle, with a trace of the cross-bar of λ, θ. Above ξ there is part of an upright, written in the same ink as the accents, but more upright than the grave over α.

554 *χωσατο δε φ]ρενας αμφι· δ[*: *χώσατο δε φρένας ἀμφί, χόλος δέ μιν ἴκετο θυμόν* a k Q: *δέ μιν* before *χόλος* m S: omitted in L^{ac} (after *χόλος* L^{pc}, m. 1?). The papyrus has a small raised V-shaped trace after *αμφι*, apparently punctuation in the form of a middle point. In that case the papyrus, like most of the MSS, took *ἀμφί* as looking back to *φρένας*, whereas m S apparently take it as looking forward to *θυμόν*. However, the last trace in the papyrus does not suit x. The ink suggests an awkward c, and might suit a λ with a rounded left-hand corner and the right-

pointing serif present elsewhere on λ , λ , λ . If this is correct, did the papyrus simply omit $\chi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ accidentally? or did it share the reading of m S, in spite of punctuation?

555 $\beta\omicron\omicron$ [c: with a k m S^{bc} (which continue here $\delta\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\eta \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} \tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\eta$): $\theta\upsilon\eta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} \beta\omega\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ Q S^{ac} (by corruption from 557).

562(?)] . [: The trace is the intersection of a horizontal and a vertical, possibly γ of $-\lambda\omicron\upsilon$, as suggested by spacing. Before this line, two lines (560–1) witnessed by b k S Q are omitted in a by homoioteleuton. Because the fragments are disjoined at precisely this point, it is impossible to tell whether or not the papyrus contained them.

564 is present in the papyrus, with a b k S Q. The entire line was suspected by Paley, as a later exegetical addition of a type similar to vv. 470, 522, 640.

Over \omicron , a grave accent is written first, then a rough breathing with both elements at a diagonal to the line and a loop at the bottom.

567 The traces are exiguous, being tops just possibly of θ from $\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\theta$. If so, the thin faded horizontal written above them could be the acute accent over \omicron . The word is so accented in this line in Π^{13} (PSI XI 1191 fr. a col. i 2).

L. CAPPONI

4656. HESIOD, *THEOGONIA* 667–84, 707–20 (?), 741–51, 752–6 (?)

A 641/5F

6.4 × 11 cm (fr. 1)

Early second century

Three fragments from a roll written in a tiny, fluid round cursive hand. The back is blank. A kollesis is visible in fr. 1. Top margin is preserved (in fr. 1) to a height of 2.2 cm.; intercolumnium at least 1.6 cm. Height of columns: c.19 cm (reconstructed) containing c.40 lines of text. The script is a round capital showing cursive influence. τ is made in three movements, with a split top. λ is of the variety where the left hand bowl has a flat top but a rounded bottom. Tongue of ϵ fails to connect with the inside of the body, and is sometimes connected to the top with a dangling stroke, but regularly projects beyond the body to connect with the following letter. Top of c falls forward to the base-line. Punctuation by high stroke (673), and by high stop (677, 678). Elision is effected but not marked. Internal organic diaeresis (674). Once (674) a mark of smooth breathing (Turner's Type 2). Iota adscript is written (667), but not consistently (omitted 672). The script compares well with P. Berol. 6926 B (Roberts, *GLH* 11a, Ninos-Romance, datable to I AD on the basis of accounts on verso referring to AD 100–1), but is written much smaller. Compare also Favorinus, *Περί φυγῆς* (Roberts, *GLH* no. 18b–c, dated 190–215 on the basis of land registers on front) which looks later (letter-forms taller than broad, and generally less rotund than the present papyrus).

In 675 the papyrus attests a probably original orthography represented nowhere in the medieval tradition. It overlaps with Π^{19} (P. Mich. inv. 6828, ed. M. L. West, *BASP* 3 (1966) 69–75 at 69–71) at 710–19 and 743–51; with Π^{29} (XXXII 2648) at 681–4, 751; with Π^5 (*Stud. Pal.* I (1901) 3–5) at 667–73.

Fr. 1

παντες θηλειαι τε και αρσε]νες ηματι κεινωι
 Τιτηνες τε θεοι και οσοι] Κρονου εξεγενοντο
 ους τε Ζευς ερεβευςφι υπο χθονος] ηκε φοϋωδε
 670 δεινοι τε κρατεροι τε βιην υπε]ροπλον εχοντε[
 των εκατον μεν χειρες απ ω]μων αιςσοντο
 πασιν ομως κεφαλαι δε ε]κατω πεντηκοντα
 εξ ωμων επεφυκον επι] ζτιβ]αρο'σι μελεσσιν'
 οι τοτε Τιτηνεςσι κατε]σταθεν εν δαι' λυγρηι
 675 πετρας ηιβατους στιβ]αρης εν χερσιν εχοντες
 Τιτηνες δ ετερωθεν εκ]αρτυναντο φαλαγγας
 προφρονεως χειρων τε] βιης θ αμα εργον εφαινον'
 αμφοτεροι δεινον δε περι]αχε ποντος απειρων'
 γη δε μεγ εσμαραγησεν ε]πτεστε[ν]ε δ ουρανος ευρυς
 680 σειομενος πεδοθεν δε τι]νας[σε]το μακρος Ολυμπος
 ριπηι υπ αθανατων ενοσι]ς δ ικαν[ε] βαρεια
 Ταρταρον ηεροεντα πο]δων αιπε[ια τ ιων
 ασπετου ιωχμοιο βολαων] τε κ[ρατεραων
 ως αρ επ αλληλοισ ιεσαν β]ελ[εα στονοεντα

Fr. 2

.
 κ]ηλα Δ[ιος
 ε]ς με[σον α]μφοτε[ρων
 710 ζμερδαλεης εριδο[
 εκ]λινθη δε μαχη πριν δ[
 εμ]μεν[ε]ως εμαχοντο δ[ια
 οι δ αρ ενι π]ρωτοιςι μαχηη [
 Κοττος] τε Βριαρεως τε Γυ[γης
 715 οι ρα τριηκο]σιας πετρας στ[ιβαρεων
]. [
 . [
 πεξ[μψαν
 719 υι[κησαντες
 ?720 . [

Fr. 3

.
 ουδας [
 αλλα κε[ν] ενθα [
 αργαλεη δεινω[ν] δε καιαθ[
 τουτο τερας και Νυκτος ερεμ[νης
 745 εστηκεν νεφελης [] κεκ[αλυμμενα
 των προσθ Ιαπετσιο []
 εστηως κεφαλη[ι
 αστεμφεως οτι Νυξ []
 αλληλας προσειπο[ν
 750 χαλκον []
 ερχετ[αι ουδ]ε ποτ αμ[φοτερας

Fr. 4

.
 ?752]...
 ?753]ξεους[
 ?754] . ε . . αν[
 ?755] . εχ . . []
 ?756]ον . []

668 is present in the papyrus, with $\Pi^5 a b k S Q$, which thus does not support Schwartz who condemned it as spurious.

669 Ζεύς is not read by *b*, but the spacing in the papyrus indicates the presence of a word of about this length (as does Π^5).

φωσδε: with $\Pi^5 a$: φάσδε *k*. After φ a round letter is suggested, rather than tail of λ.

671–3 are present in the papyrus, as well as in Π^5 and $a b k S Q$: Wolf's condemnation of them is thus not corroborated.

673 *στιβαροῖσι μελέσσι*: with $a b k$ (*μελέσσι* U) S Q: *στιβαροῖς μελέσσι* Tr.

675 *στιβ]αρης*: i.e. *στιβαρης* with Mosqu. 642 in a correction (reported by West): -αις *b*: -ὰς *a k S Σ*. The orthography -ῆς is to be preferred, with West.

682 *πο]δων αιπε[ια*: with $a b k S Q$: *ποδων τ' αιπειά* ἴ [Π^{29} : [Π^{28}]. Π^{29} supports Hermann's transposition of τ'. Unless the papyrus lacked τ(ε), its reading lends ancient support to the order of the medieval MSS against Hermann, namely *ποδῶν αιπειά* τ(ε).

684 β]ε]λα: Traces show top of round letter with a horizontal stroke exiting to right from middle, compatible with the scribe's cursive ε connecting from mid-stroke, amply illustrated in the papyrus. The following letter is the top of a slightly diagonal stroke, compatible with λ, but with no trace of the left leg. Connecting stroke from preceding ε would meet the right leg at about mid-level. If -ελ-, the papyrus agreed with the transmitted *ἕεαν*

βέλεα στονόεντα. Π^{29} has]φεσανστονόεντ[, conjectured by West ap. XXXI 2648 and his edition of *Theog.* to have been ε]φεσαν στονόεντ[α βέλεμνα on the basis of *Od.* 24.180 ἄλλοις ἐφίει βέλεα στονόεντα, where P. Ryl. I 53 has στονόεντα βέλεμνα.

707–8 are read by the papyrus along with *a b S Q*: omitted by *k* (where it is supplied in **K** and **U** by the first hand).

711 πρῖν δ[: with Π^{19} and most MSS: πρὸ (with δ' added above) L: πρὸς δ' *m*.

714 Βριαρεως: with *a b k S Q*: βριαρης Π^{19} (corrected by a second hand): Ὀβριάρεως conjectured by Hermann (the name also at 149 and 617).

716 An indistinct trace, possibly κ or κα.

717 .[: Not prima facie τ1 as expected: bottom of a diagonal followed by bottom of a vertical.

719 νι[κῆσαντες: at line-beginning with Π^{19} and the rest of the medieval tradition, which thus does not support Rzach's transposition χερσιν νικῆσαντες.

?720 .[: Not the lower part of τ or τo as expected, perhaps η.

743 δε: with Π^{19} a **K**: τε *u*.

744–5 are present with Π^{19} and Π^{28} and *a b k S Q*, which thus does not support West's exclusion of them.

747 εστηως: with *b k S Q*: ἐστειώς *a*.

748 οτι: with *a b k S Q*:]θι Π^{19} .

?752–6 The preserved traces are compatible in all but 752 with these lines. If correctly identified, they stood at the beginning of col. iii.

?753]ξεους[. For the shape of γ cf. that of οὐρανός in 679. εἶοῦα is suggested, and the only possible positions in *Theog.* at line-end are 448 and 752–3. The following three lines could be read as conforming to the transmitted line-ends of 754–6 (and are not compatible with 449–51). The line preceding this line, however, does not appear compatible with the transmitted version in either place: it looks more like ων or νν, preceded by an indistinguishable trace. If we do not assume that these are line-ends, we could have εουc at mid-line, as e.g. in 467 εἶοῦc, but the rest would not fit there either.

?754].ε. .av[: Apparently εστ av (i.e. round letter after ε suggesting c and not incompatible with γ) with *k* (i.e. εστ' άv): εδτ' άv *a b S*. Scheer conjectured εἶc δ' χ', which is apparently not corroborated by the papyrus.

D. OBBINK

4657. HESIOD, *THEOGONIA* 820–31, 859–65

A16/5B(a)

9.5 × 9 cm (fr. 1)

Second century

Two scraps from a roll written across the fibres in a decent second century Informal round book-hand. Both have documentary writing on the front (fr. 1.3 *Καίσαρος*), but in different hands; it seems that separate documents were glued together at the heavy kollesis which can be seen in the right-hand margin of fr. 1. The literary scribe wrote some accents, and a mark of elision; middle stop at the end of 822; high stops are positioned above the letter after which the punctuation belongs without spacing, thus apparently placed after the line was written. The correction in 826 is apparently by a different hand (the ο is narrower).

The papyrus includes the suspect lines 826–9, and especially 828; gives no help with the crux in 823; and offers new errors in 824, 826, and 827.

The papyrus overlaps at 859–65 with Π^{12} (PSI IX 1086); at 863–5 with P. Lit. Palau Rib. 9. P. Mich. inv. 4270 (T. Renner, *ZPE* 29 (1978) 5–13 at 9–10) contains parts of 520–6,

but different parts of the lines; the same for Π¹⁵ (P. Ant. II 71, a sixth-century papyrus codex) at 825–31 (which it gives in a different order).

Fr. 1

820 ουρανο]ν ἐξέλα[σε Ζεὺς
 Τυφώε]α Γαῖα πελώρη
 χρυ]σῆν Ἀφροδίτην·
 ἐρ]γματ' ἐχουσαι
 κρατερο]ν θεοῦ· ἐκ δὲ τῆ ὤμω]ν
 825 δει]νοιο δρακοντος
 λελιχ]μοτες· ἐκ δέ τε ὄς[
 ο]φρυι πῦρ αμαρυς[εν
] καιετο δερκομεν[οιο
 δειν]ηις κεφαληι
 830 αθεσφατο]ν· ἀλ[λ]οτε μὲν γὰρ
 συνιέ]μεν [α]λλο[τε] δ [αυτε

Fr. 2

φλοξ δ]ε κε[ραυνωθεντος
 860 ουρέ]ος ἐν βης[χηι
 πληγ]εντος πο[λλη
 αυτμ]ῆι θεσπε[χηι
 τεχνηι υ]π αιζή'ω]ν
 θαλφθει]ς ηεσιδ[ηρος
 865 ουρεος ε]ν βης[χηι

822 χρυ]σῆν: with b a k S B Q; χρυσῆν Vaticanus 915 Parisinus 2772 Florentinus Laurentianus 31.32 (according to Rzach). Rzach corrected to χρυσῆν.

823 ἐρ]γματ': with a b k Q; ἔργα τ' S.

824 δὲ τῆ: Here and in 826 δέ τε is written for δέ οἱ. In 826 οἱ appears as a suprascript correction over τε (which, however, is not cancelled). But here in 824 τε apparently is the reading of the text (with no correction). Cf. 688 ἐκ δέ τε πάσαν / φαῖνε βίην.

825 δει]νοιο: with b; κρατεροῖο a k Q S.

826 λελιχ]μοτες: with a b k Q S and Anecd. Oxon. 1.262.28: -ότος Triclinius' version.

εκ . . . οςζ[: ἐκ . . . ὄσσων is read by *a b k Q S* and followed by Solmsen; West prints ἐν (U) . . . ὄσσε (Glasgu. Hunt. U. 6. 1, of 15th/16th cent.).

827 *αμαρυσσ[εν]*: so *a b k Q S* and printed by West: ἀμάρυσσον is conjectured by West in his app. crit.

826–9 are removed by Fick as an ancient interpolation; 828 was similarly removed by Ruhnken. All three lines are present here, as also in *Π*¹⁵; note, however, that there the lines are given in a different order: 827, 828, 831, 829, 832, while 830 has been omitted and added above by a second hand, whereas the present papyrus shows exactly the same lines and order as the medieval MSS.

862 *αυτμ]ῆι*: with *Π*¹² (*αυ]τμη* required by space), presumably agreeing with ἀῦτμηῆ in *b Q S*; the spacing requires four letters in the initial lacuna (therefore not ἀτμηῆ as in *k* or ἀυτῆ as in *a*).

863 After *αιζη* iota mutum is inserted suprascript in error: *αιζηων Π*¹² and *αιζηω(ν)* P. Lit. Palau Rib. 9 with *a b k Q S* which read *αιζηών*. According to Eustath. 1117.3 some ancient scholars believed (εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀληθῶς) that *αιζηός* should be written by analogy with the four-syllable *αιζήϊος*.

P. J. PARSONS

4658. HESIOD, *THEOGONIA* 913–17

103/224(e)

2.6 × 5.1 cm

Third century

A small scrap from a roll showing the top of a column written in a script of the Formal mixed style. The back is blank. Top margin at least 2 cm. The medium-large script is generously spaced, both between individual letters and between the lines, but otherwise shows no pretensions to formality and has a slight slant to the right. It is larger, less closely written, and more widely spaced than **4653** (above, part of XXXII **2648**). Insofar as letters are represented here, XVII **2098** (pl. III; Roberts, *GLH* 19b, Herodotus VII) of the ‘first half of the third century’ (land survey of the reign of Gallienus on the back) is comparable. Note *c* of the tall and narrow variety like *ε*. *μ* with a shallow rounded saddle. Diagonal of *ν* meets the right upright considerably above the foot. There are no lectional signs in evidence and no opportunity to observe iota adscript. The fragment shows no deviations from the transmitted text.

The papyrus overlaps with XXXII **2639** fr. e (+ PSI XI 1191) = *Π*¹³.

915 η τεκε Περσεφονη]ν λευκ[ωλενον
 ηρπασεν ης παρα] μητρο[*c*
 Μνημοσυνης δ εξ] αυτις [
 εξ ης οι Μουσαι χρυς]ζαμμ[πυκες
 εννεα τησιων αδον θαλι]α κ[αι

915 εξ] αυτις [: Over]*a* there is a slight trace of ink that may be the remains of a circumflex as in *Π*¹³, which gives εξᾶντις.

D. OBBINK

4659. HESIOD, *OPERA ET DIES* 8, 17–27

35 4B.101/C(1–3)b

5.7 × 8.2 cm

Second century
Plate VII

Twelve lines from the bottom of a column written across the fibres in a semi-cursive script. On the other side, written along the fibres in a different hand, are six line-ends of a document (part of an account?) followed by a wide margin (there is no kollesis). The lower margin is preserved to a depth of 1.7 cm. At the left is a margin or *agraphon* preserved to a width of at least 2.5 cm. Unless it was a miniature roll with exceptionally short columns, this must have been the first column of *Op.* to have been copied. In the bottom margin v. 8 (apparently missed out when the upper portion of the column was written) has been inscribed by the same hand in smaller letters and marked in the left margin with an insertion sign. In addition, three lines (apparently copied out of sequence) have been marked by the original scribe with round *περιγραφαί* in the left margin. (To judge from parallel cases, the lines may have been closed with similar round brackets facing left at the right ends, now lost: see note.) The length of the original hexameter lines and thus the width of the column may be estimated at 9–10 cm. The reconstructed height of the column (assuming 26 lines in this column with v. 8 omitted and no initial title) is *c.*15.5 cm. The height of the reconstructed roll, allowing for a top margin of two thirds the height of the bottom margin, would be *c.*19 cm.

The script is an unprofessional round semi-cursive with frequent connection between letters and some variation in letter size, especially in width of letters. The writing is only roughly bilinear, with φ and ψ and occasionally ι violating the top and bottom line (but note β and ρ bounded by top and bottom line, i.e. raised slightly rather than dipping beneath the line). There is connection of top-stroke of ρ and τ to or from the tongue of ε. V-shaped γ; the top-stroke of τ is a single stroke; μ with a low round saddle and a slight blob or serif on the foot of its first stroke; ψ is a simple cross. c falls forward at end of word. Note ø in one movement with the cross-stroke carried forward beyond the body in connection with following letter. ε is written in three strokes, with the top placed separately and tongue often detached from the body but extending beyond its jaws to connect with the following letter, giving the impression of documentary affinity and a date in the later second century. For palaeographic parallels see P. Ryl. III 463 (*GLH* no. 20c, Gospel of Mary), assigned to middle of the third century, since it was perhaps composed not earlier than mid-second century, though this assignment rests partly on the palaeographic dating (D. Lührmann, *Fragmente apokryph gewordenen Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (Marburg 2000) 64); VIII 1100 (*GLH* no. 20b, Edict of Prefect, AD 206).

Punctuation is by high point placed probably by the original scribe but after writing the line (i.e. without independent space) in 22 marking weak pause; perhaps also by (an unusually short) paragraphus before 25 (i.e. below 21) and after 27 (i.e. before 22), if these are not simply strokes leading into the top and bottom of their respective round brackets.

There is a complement of lectional signs: apostrophe in 23; in 20 an initial long vowel is superscribed with a horizontal stroke and another sign of uncertain import (see note), and a medial short (accented) vowel is marked with an acute accent (cf. initially over a short accented vowel in 24). Elision is effected (and there marked with apostrophe) in the one place where we expect it. There is no opportunity to observe whether or not iota-adscript was written.

The text contains a high rate of variation and obvious scribal error in a short span: omission (uncorrected) of a word in 19, omission of one whole line, and three lines copied out of sequence. This is a high rate of error for a scribe so early in the poem and roll (i.e. in 5 of out of the first 20 lines). A professional scribe might have been expected to make a new start (assuming the errors were realized sufficiently early). It is not likely that another text (e.g. *Theogonia*, *Catalogus*, or some other) preceded in the roll: there is no kollesis in evidence, and the wide margin following the document on the front might indicate the end of a documentary roll at at the point where *Op.* begins on the back; if so, there would have been no space on the back for any text to have preceded.

It is not certain that the text continued after this column. But given the use of the diagonal insertion sign (see on 8 and cf. 4660 98) to mark the point of insertion of a missing line in this column, the marking of 25–7 as deleted or misplaced could be taken as implying a following column where the presence of these lines was required or otherwise relevant. In spite of its errors, the papyrus contains at least one correct reading at a point where major branches of the tradition diverge (24). Two of the three scribal errors listed above stand corrected in the papyrus. These methods of correction are standard ones in formal book production, although not entirely consistent with the insouciance of the informal hand and the construction of the roll (a reused back).

The addition of v. 8 in the lower margin makes this the earliest portion of *Op.* preserved on papyrus (several papyri preserve the beginning of *Theogonia*). Π³⁹ (XLV 3220) contains part of 15–16 and an interlinear addition to 17 but from a different part of the line. The notes below follow the order of verses in the papyrus.

- 17 την δ] ετερη[ν
 18 θη]κε δε μιν [
 19 γα[ι]ης τε ριζη[ιαι
 20 η τε και ᾱπα[λαμ-
 21 εις ετερον γ[αρ
 25 (̄ και κεραμευ[ς κεραμει
 26 (και πτωχος π[τωχωι
 27 (ω Περση κυ δ[ε
 22 πλουσιον' ος [

- 23 οἰκόν τ' εὐ θ[εσθαι
 24 εἰς ἀφενος ς[πευδοντ

In the lower margin:

- 8 / Ζεὺς υψιβρεμε[της

19 τρεζη[σι: τ' ἐν ῥίζησι ο and Proclus' commentary: ἐν ῥίζησι without τ(ε) Par. 2763 and *e*. In the epic initial rho can make position (Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i 177, noting δέ long before ῥίζαν at *Il.* 11.846), so the papyrus' reading is not unmetrical, but it is unsatisfactory grammatically (especially since the simple dative makes a misleading parallel with the following ἀνδράσι). Elsewhere in the papyrus final vowels are elided where expected (23, required by space in 17). We could assume omission of ν and correct to τ ε(ν) ριζη[σι. Otherwise we must suppose that the preposition itself dropped at an earlier stage in an exemplar that showed scriptio plena (τρε ἐν) at this point.

20 ἀπά[λαμ: ἀπάλαμον E^c ψ₄ ψ₉, correctly: ἀπάλαμον Ω D Φ. There is a long mark over the first α of ἀπάλαμον (correctly), and above it another mark (in the form of a mid-point followed by short upright, resembling a smooth-breathing mark of form 1 (Turner, *GMAW*² p. 11), but without the horizontal connected to the vertical. However, it could also be interpreted as an attempt at a grave accent, so that we would have the expected ἀπά[λ-.

25–7 are written after 21. The lines are marked by round περιγραφαί in the left margin (perhaps their counterparts also stood at ends of lines in the right margin, now lost, as in some of the parallel cases given below). Strictly speaking, these signal trouble or mark a deletion and/or misplacement. But it may be concluded that the lines were copied in the wrong place. There is no textual tradition of the disturbance or inauthenticity of 25–7 (or 22–4), nor can they stand in this position. 25 καὶ κτλ. interrupts a sentence left incomplete in 21, before πλούσιον in enjambment in 22, which can not therefore continue after 27. Clearly the eye of the scribe (or one at an earlier stage in the paradisus) has skipped three lines down from the end of 21 to the beginning of 25, misled by the fact that both lines 22 and 25 follow on after a line beginning with εἰς (21 and 24 respectively). How their placement was indicated in the following column (now lost) is uncertain. If the transposed lines were present in the scribe's exemplar in the same position in which they appear in the manuscript tradition (which is not certain), and the scribe caught his mistake in time, he would have copied 25–7 as the opening lines of the following column. It is possible that the omission was not discovered until collation (with the exemplar, if it had them, or another copy, if it did not), and the point of insertion in the following column was marked at that time with a diagonal insertion sign like that which appears before 8 in the surviving column. Alternatively, the lines could have been added in the margin above the following column (now lost), in the same way in which v. 8 when discovered missing was copied in the margin at the bottom of col. 1 (leaving there no room for inscription of the additionally misplaced 25–7). The point of insertion would in this case have then been similarly marked in the margin of the following column at a point of which we can no longer be certain: there is no way of knowing for certain whether, after correction, the papyrus' text intended 25–7 to follow directly upon 24.

The use of brackets (περιγραφαί) to signal trouble or mark a deletion (especially of misplaced material) is variously exemplified: X 1234 fr. 2 col. i 14 (pl. IV, Alcaeus fr. 71 Lobel–Page/Voigt), where the first verse of a new poem after a coronis was originally omitted, then supplied by a corrector who encloses the line in round brackets, and further re-copies it in its proper position as line 2 (= i 15) of the new poem while tacitly emending a miswriting. More dramatically: P. Vatic. 11 (Favorinus, *De exilio*) cols. xiii 39–xiv 11 marking a falsely placed passage (M. Norsa and G. Vitelli, *Il papiro vaticano greco* 11, *Studi e testi* 53 (Città del Vaticano 1931) 9, 24–5 with tavv. VII–VIII): here the scribe's eye has wandered from col. xiii 38 ἀποδημίας to the same point in the following column, xiv 32 αὐτοῦ ἀποθανεῖν, and he proceeded to copy out the entire passage xiv 32 αὐτοῦ ἀποθανεῖν to xv 6 κακῶς before noticing and redressing his mistake. Then he marked for excision xiii 39–49 (together with the second half of line 38) and xiv 1–14 — each with its own set of round brackets, i.e. one on the left facing right and another on the right facing left, marking in addition the beginning and end of the entire passage to be excised with an X, and writing above the line at the beginning a *reclamans* with which the passage picks up again after the redundant section at

col. xiv 15. The scribe of the Vatican Favorinus has used single, large round brackets to mark the entire passage, whereas in the present papyrus individual brackets are applied to each of the three lines in sequence, following standard practice for single lines copied out of sequence: for examples see *GMW*² p. 16 and nos. 15, 25, 63, 76, with p. 148 n. 26 on the use of *περιγραφαί* in documentary papyri, and add P. Herc. 243 fr. 3.9–12 (A. Henrichs, *CErc* 13 (1983) 33–43 at 38–9; W. Luppe, *CErc* 14 (1984) 109–24), four lines copied out of sequence from the same level in the following column (where the point of insertion is marked with an interlinear *κάτω* and the lines written by another hand in a slightly different word order in the lower margin), with the whole passage marked as out of position by a square upper and lower half-bracket in the left margin (the right margin is lost), one above the first and another below the last of the misplaced lines.

25 *κεραμευ[ς κεραμει*: with *ε ο* (unless the papyrus omitted *κεραμεί* in error): *κεραμεί κεραμεύς* var. lect. Aristot. *Pol.* 1312^b5. There is no way of knowing how the line ended. Plat. *Lys.* 215c quotes the line with the ending *ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῶ*, which the MSS give as the ending of 26, and Prisc. *Inst.* 18.145 gives the ending of 26 as *καὶ τέκτωνι τέκτων* which in the MSS concludes 25. There is no evidence for disordering of 25–7 in the secondary or medieval tradition.

Over the initial *κ* there is a bit of stray ink (unless it is a lineation dot). Possibly in conjunction with the round bracket there is a very short paragraphus, extending into the margin (if it is not simply part of the round bracket), i.e. a horizontal which extends to the left from the top of the hasta of *κ*, which it meets at the same point as the top tip of the round bracket. If it is indeed a paragraphus, it must have been carried over from a point where it appeared in an exemplar signalling a break in an originally preceding line 24, since there is no break anywhere in 22 which actually precedes in the text as written. Cf. on 27. But it is clearly written in connection with and as part of the round bracket, rather than cohering with the preceding line.

27 Possibly a very short paragraphus under the first letter of the line (apparently not simply a continuation of the round bracket: there is no connection). If so, it must have been carried over from a point where it appeared in an exemplar marking weak pause after 27, since there is no pause in 21, i.e. the line preceding 22 which actually follows 27 here in the text as written.

22 *πλουσιον' ος* [. Note that, after having been originally copied out of sequence and subsequently corrected, the papyrus' reading is the same as all MSS (i.e. with *ε ο*), against various emendations designed to solve the grammatical problems of 21–3.

24 *ἀφενος*: with *ε Ω Φ*, correctly: *ἄφενον* D *ψ*, variant reading in *Φ* and Stob. 3.38.25, *Σ* Opp. *Hal.* 1.500, *Orac. Sib.* 14.276.

8 The verse is written in the lower margin by the same hand in smaller letters and marked in the left margin with an insertion sign (a diagonal rising from below the line of writing left to right to the point where the line begins). One suspects that a corresponding sign must have originally stood in the margin of the upper portion of the column at the intended point of insertion (as in **4660** (Hes. *Op.*) below and to the left of v. 98 marking omission at this point of 99). If this was at the same point at which 8 appears in the manuscript tradition, this would have been closer by far to the top than to the bottom of the column, and the missing line would therefore have been expected to be supplied in the top margin, were this not the opening column of the poem. Note therefore that the missing line is written in the bottom margin here rather than (as would be otherwise expected) in the upper margin, since standing at the top of the column, it would have immediately preceded v. 1 and the beginning of *Op.*, so that in this case the work would have seemed to begin not with v. 1, but with 8 together with announcement of the error and its correction.

4660. HESIOD, *OPERA ET DIES* 57–63(?), 91–106 (MISSING 93, 99)

35 4B.70/M(5)a

4.3 × 13.7 cm

First century BC/first century AD

Beginnings of 14 verses from the the top of a column, plus a few letters from the ends of the preceding column in a stylised capital. The back is blank. Upper margin is preserved to a height of 3 cm, presumably the original top edge. An intercolumnium (1.1 cm at its narrowest) is delimited by three line-ends of the preceding column. Apparently one accent (grave) is written (104). The scribe writes iota adscript (104) and effects elision without signalling it (106). If the lines of col. i are correctly identified, the columns contained 34 lines, at a height of c.28 cm (reconstructed).

The hand is a Formal round type of a date early for Oxyrhynchus: it shows ϵ with tongue detached from the inside of its bowl, but confined within its body in the manner of the epsilon-theta style reminiscent of hands of the first century BC. μ has legs curving out at bottom, and a deep curve in its middle almost in an angle (100). τ in two strokes with a split-top (98). α is of the angular variety, in which the lower arm meets the left arm just beneath mid-level, and the left arm meets the right one below the top of the latter. The hand shows broad strokes with no shading, but decoration in the form of wide horizontal feet and serifs on the bottoms of uprights (pointing outward in opposite directions on the feet of π and η) and on the tops of uprights. That these have their origin in connecting strokes is obvious by the level of connection between letters, e.g. α connecting to \circ at the bottom line (97), but in 98 connection is effected via the serifs at the tops of letters. In principle the hand could be of the first century AD, as e.g. II **246** (Roberts, *GLH* 10c), return of sheep, AD 66. But the decoration, especially the serifs and finials, is more in keeping with hands of the late first century BC, so as to suggest comparison with P. Fayum 7 (Roberts, *GLH* 9b), H. *Od.* VI, and P. Fayum 6 (Roberts, *GLH* 9c), H. *Il.* XXI, both dated by the documents with which they were found to the late first century BC. All of this recommends a date not later than the early first century AD, though a date in the late first century BC is not to be ruled out.

The scribe omits two lines, for one of which (99) the insertion point (after v. 98) has been correctly placed by a corrector; this line is also omitted by Plutarch. The other (93) is unmarked. The papyrus adds ancient authority to the omission of this line by one group of medieval MSS. A supralinear notation of a unique variant in 100 suggests collation with another copy.

Π^{41} (XLV **3221**) contains parts of 91–108 but preserves a different portion of the lines.

Col. i

?57

απαντε]ε

?58

αμφαγαπων]τες

59–62 lost

?63

Αθηνη]ν

64–90 lost

Col. ii

91 νοσφιν α[τερ
 92 ν[ουρων
 94 αλλα γυνη [
 95 εκκεδα[ε
 96 μουνη δ[
 97 ενδον εμ[-
 98 / εξεπτη π[ροσθεν
 100 αλλα [[δ]]'τε μυ[ρια
 πλειη μεν γαρ [
 νο[υκοι δ] α[νθρωποιων
 αυτομα[ε-
 105 ουτως [
 ει δεθελ[

Col. i

58? αμφαγαπων]τες: A trace of the cross-bar of ε and the end of the horizontal of τ are visible. This appears to rule out the other candidate for placement of this line-end and the one above it, namely 66–7, both of which end in ε (that placement would result in columns of only 14 lines high).

63? Αθηνη]ν: The surviving trace is a vertical leaning to the left at top with a foot curving sharply right at bottom, and the end of a diagonal from the left connecting with the vertical somewhat above the line. Examples of η elsewhere have upright hastas and do not exhibit the horizontal connecting stroke on the feet. But we do not know how they looked at line-end, and the ends of the lines after 67 do not offer any alternatives.

Col. 2

92 ν[: An upright leaning slightly to the right with a finial on its foot and a trace of the diagonal descending from its top. After that the horizontal fibres are stripped, and only the vertical remain.

93 is missing as it is in Pr Ω D Tz φ₅ ψ₆ ψ₇ Origen *c. Cels.* 4.48: αἴψα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι βροτοὶ καταγηράσκουσιν (= *Od.* 19.360) E φ₆ φ₇ ψ₉ Mo Tr, in the margin in different hand in N φ* ψ*. In P⁴¹ the traces are insufficient to determine its presence. The papyrus supplies ancient authority for its absence from the original *paradosis*, and suggests that it was an addition later than the first century BC. The corrector takes no notice of the omission, unlike that of 99.

97 μ[-: ἔμιμνε C D Φ ψ₆ ψ₉ ψ₁₀ Origen *c. Cels.* 4.38: ἔμιενε ψ* ι*: an illegible supralinear variant C^{1st}. The papyrus does not decide.

98 Below and to the left of this line-beginning a corrector has written an ancora mark in the form of a diagonal stroke (without a round top) in an ink lighter than that of the main hand, marking the omission of v. 99. To

judge from the (downward pointing) direction of the stroke, the line was probably written in the bottom margin as in **4659** 8 (where see note). For the diagonal stroke marking omission and point of insertion see Turner, *GMAW*² p. 16 with further examples.

After 98, 99 (*αἰγυόχου βουλήει Διὸς νεφέληγγερέταο*) is missing in the papyrus, as it is in the quotation of 94–104 at ‘Plut.’ *Mor.* 105DE (which quotes 94–104), though it is present in *o* and present in *Π*⁴¹. The coincidence with Plutarch here suggests that 99 was omitted in at least one branch of the ancient tradition (now with no medieval descendents), but was present in some manuscripts circulating contemporaneously with the papyrus, and so was here noted and added by a corrector by collation with a MS different from the scribe’s exemplar.

100 δε: so the papyrus before correction with *o*. In the papyrus δ(ε) has been corrected to τ(ε): over δ a τ of smaller size has been written with a different pen and more faded ink (possibly followed by a mid-point), but the δ was not deleted. Thus presumably we have a variant recorded from collation with another ancient manuscript.

101 χαρ: The horizontal fibres are here stripped, and the traces preserved only by seepage onto the vertical fibres beneath.

103 αυτομα[τ-: ἀυτόματα Stobaeus 4.43.32 *Et. Sym. Et. Magn.*: -τοὶ οἰ^κ, but the papyrus gives no help here.

104 This verse was suspected by an ancient critic according to the scholia because of the apparent absurdity (so West) of giving the diseases a voice, although the scholia refute this, offering the parallels of Eris and Deimos in Homer. The papyrus text takes no notice of the controversy.

106 εἰ δεθελ[: Only tops of round letters are preserved, but the number of them shows that there was only one epsilon between δ and θ. We cannot be sure that εἰ δε θελ- is not to be understood from the papyrus, rather than εἰ δ’ ἐθελεῖς, printed by editors following most MSS.

D. OBBINK

4661. HESIOD, OPERA ET DIES 563–7

81 2B.85/32(a)

2.5 × 3.1 cm

Third century

A scrap from the middle of a column of a papyrus roll written parallel to the fibres. The back is blank. The script is of the Formal mixed type of medium size with a slant to the right and slight shading (horizontal strokes, e.g. cross-bar of π, η, τ, as well as certain oblique strokes, e.g. lower oblique of α fairly thin, while vertical downstrokes are rather thicker). There is little decoration, apart from the hook at the beginning of the cross-stroke of τ. α in three strokes sharply pointed at left. α with a bottom at an angle to the line, with a concave right-hand oblique and hook at the bottom. ε has a flat back and long tongue extending beyond the body. μ in three strokes with a curved saddle coming about two thirds of the way down to the line of writing; ο small but not tiny, and floating between the lines. π with a right-hand vertical shorter than the left and a cross-bar projecting over it to the right. ω with right leaning sides and a flat bottom. ρ with tail below the line curving slightly to left. τ with a blunt (not pointed) descender below the line and cross-bar at mid-level, connecting from tongue of ε. It may be compared with XXVII **2452** (pII. I–II; *GMAW*² 27, Sophocles?, *Theseus*) assigned to the third century (see p. 149 n. 48). ω in **2452** more rounded and upright, whereas in the present hand it is angular and slanting, and τ has a hook at left side of the cross-bar. No accents or other diacritical signs are in evidence. No opportunity to observe whether any punctuation was indicated (perhaps a small space is left between words before ρ in 566), or whether iota adscript was written. No evidence of corrections or

additions by a second hand. Apparently an iotacistic spelling in 563. There are no new variants in evidence; but the papyrus includes 563, known to have been suspected in antiquity. **4648** 22 quotes part of 567 but a different part of the verse.

· · · · · ·

Γη παντων μητηρ καρπον κυμ]με[ικτον
 ευτ αν δ εξηκοντα μετα τρο]πας ηελ[ιοιο
 565 χειμερι εκτελεσει Ζευς ημα]τα δη ρα [
 Αρκτουρος προλιπων ιερο]ν ροον Ω[κεανοιο
 πρωτον παμφαιων επιτ]ελλετ[αι

· · · · · ·

563 The line was athetized along with 561–2 by Plutarch in his commentary (fr. 77 Sandbach), but his reasons are not preserved. He may not have been the first to do so, since the verses are not represented in the Scholia vetera, though they were known to Et^G A and the later scholia and are present in *o*.

566 ιερο]ν: Its presence is shown by spacing together with alignment with the letters above, with Ω Φ: omitted by D ψ₃: placed after ῥόον in ω⁴ φ⁷+

K. DOULAMIS

4662. HESIOD, OPERA ET DIES 771(?)–6

69/4(c)

6.8 × 2.6 cm

Late second century

Five lines from the bottom of a column from a papyrus roll written along the fibres in a good book-hand. The back is blank. The lower margin is preserved to a depth of 3 cm. The text is thoroughly marked up with accents, breathings, and punctuation. The date of the hand (an earlier version of the Formal mixed type) is evidenced by the μ in four distinct strokes; ω with a slight rise in the centre of its bottom looks somewhat later by comparison; similarly mid-stroke of ε and ϑ extend beyond the body. The letters are well spaced, with a consistent slant to the right, and final strokes of letters are lifted, e.g. right leg of λ and ν, the latter with an extended, almost vertical middle, giving the impression that the hand is written more rapidly than in actuality. A carefully penned copy, as far as we can tell, written with a broad pen with only minimal shading. For a parallel compare I **26** (*GLH* 19a, Demosthenes, *Prooemia*, with documentary annotations probably of the second century).

Punctuation is signalled by high (and possibly medial) point. Accents (circumflex, grave, possibly acute). A mark of breathing (smooth: form 1, *GMAW*² p. 11). The diacriticals were added after the text was written in a finer pen and blacker ink than that of the main text.

The papyrus overlaps with *Π*⁵ (*Stud. Pal.* I (1901) xviii), and with *Π*³⁹ (*XLV 3220*) at 775–6. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 237 (P) fr. B + C (published by R. Luiselli, *ZPE* 142 (2003) 157–9) contains parts of 771–4 but different parts of the lines. There are no new readings,

but the presence of 776, missing in a twelfth-century manuscript (E) but present in both previously published papyri, is corroborated.

· · · · ·
]·
 ηματ]α μῆνος [
 πενεσθ]αι·
 με]ν ἐσθλαῖ
 775 καρπο]ν ἀμᾶσθα[ι
 αμεί]νων [
 · · · · ·

771(?)]·: A small point of ink at mid-level, possibly the end of 771 (no punctuation is expected after 770), which is shorter than the following 772 by five letters. The trace may be a medial point of punctuation at line-end, as the remainder of the line has been left blank. Compare 773, which ends at exactly this point, also with a mark of punctuation.

773 The point of punctuation is at the level of the top of ι, which elsewhere rises somewhat above the tops of the letters.

774 ἐσθλαῖ: The first accent warns against placement of the acute in this syllable (see on **4653** 414; **4655** 550); the second is a grave accent, with 775 regarded as continuing without a strong pause.

776 αμεί]νων: with Ω D: 776–90 are missing in E. Presumably the papyrus had these lines, as did Π⁵ and Π³⁹, which also attest parts of each, and there is as yet no papyrus which lacks them.

A trace of ink over the first ν must be the right end of an acute accent on the now lost ει. There is also a blob of ink directly beneath ω, with blank surface on either side of it, apparently just stray ink (no punctuation is expected at the end of 777).

D. OBBINK

4663. HESIOD, OPERA ET DIES END-TITLE

38 3B.79/E(3)a

10.5 × 26.5 cm

Second century

A large sheet of re-used papyrus, blank on one side except for the title, containing in the middle of the sheet four words written across the fibres and centred over three lines. On the front and along the fibres but the other way up is an extensive register (κώμ(η), οἰκί(α), and proper names occur with frequency in long lines) in a hand of the second century. Above the first line is 12.5 cm of blank papyrus; below the third line is 10.5 cm, also blank. The three lines of writing occupy a square 4 × 4 cm. Height of the taller letters is 0.7 cm; about the same distance is maintained between the lines of writing. The lines are preceded by an *agraphon* of at least 5.5 cm in width. Presumably the text of *Op.* (828 verses in the medieval MSS) preceded, likewise written on the re-used documentary back. Very likely the end-title was centred horizontally in a final blank (i.e. with c.5 cm missing to the right (which would give room for the line-ends of the documentary column on the front).

The hand is a spindly, rapidly written Informal semi-round bookhand that could be

dated to the second century. It shows contrast between tall vertical strokes and short horizontal ones, between tall narrow letters (ϵ , ι , κ) and wider short ones (λ , \omicron), while η and γ provide additional contrast in that they have the height of the taller letters but are also wide. \omicron , diminutive and floating in the middle between the lines, looks forward to the Severe Style. γ is made out of a wide, shallow rounded bowl balanced on a longish stem with a pointed tail descending below the line and curving slightly to the left. ι is ligatured to preceding λ in the manner of a documentary script. The shape of κ is reminiscent of the Chancery Style. The rounded, detached bowl of γ suggests the shape of the later first or early second century. But formality (together with size) may be exaggerated in the writing of an end-title. As such it may give an impression of being earlier than it really is. This finds confirmation in μ , for example, which has a rounded middle at mid-level. The writing of the main text (assuming, as usual, that it is the same hand as that which penned the end-title) may be imagined as slightly smaller and more informal than the letters of the title. Perhaps a private rather than professional copy, as suits the re-use of the documentary back.

Thin decorative strokes (as commonly in titles), straight in intent but rapidly and flamboyantly placed, bound the tops and bottoms of the letters at the beginning and ends of the lines. A similar stroke, likewise in the same ink as the writing, appears under $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha$ in 2. After this stroke there are also several traces in different, darker ink (if it is not simply grime), where something appears to have been rubbed out.

This is the first end-title of *Op.* from a papyrus roll. It is unknown whether *Theog.* or any other text preceded *Op.* in the roll; it is possible, but not certain, that no other text followed (see above). P. Achm. 3 = Π^3 , a 4th–5th-c. papyrus codex from Panopolis, preserves *Theog.* 75–106, 108–45 and none of the text of *Op.*, but includes an end-title (‘titre final ou $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$ ’ according to P. Collart in P. Achm. 3 p. 47) bearing the author’s name and titles of *Theog.*, *Op.*, and *Scut.*, apparently from a codex containing all three works. P. Vindob. G 19815 = Π^5 (a later 4th-c. parchment codex: *GBEBP* no. 11b p. 30) preserves parts of *Theog.*, *Op.* (including the end, to v. 828), and beginning of *Scut.*, and includes an end-title for *Op.* ($\text{Η} \epsilon\iota\omicron\delta\omicron[v \text{ Ε} \rho\gamma] \alpha \text{ και } [\text{Η} \mu \epsilon\rho] \alpha\iota$) and an initial-title for *Scut.* ($\text{Η} \epsilon\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon \text{ Α} \epsilon\pi\iota\varsigma$) (Wessely, *Stud. Pal.* 1 (1901) xx–xxi). **4659**, also a re-used documentary back, could be roughly contemporary in date and is written in a similarly informal hand. But the ink is different, being considerably darker, and γ is V-shaped.

$\overline{\text{Η} \epsilon\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon}$
 $\overline{\text{Ε} \rho\gamma\alpha}$
 $\overline{\text{και Η} \mu \epsilon\rho} \left[\begin{array}{l} \overline{\text{αι}} \\ \overline{\text{αι}} \end{array} \right.$

4664. HESIOD, *SCUTUM* 92–106

75/18(b)

8.5 × 9.6 cm

Late first/early second century

Top of a column with upper margin (at least 2.5 cm) written across the fibres of a papyrus roll in narrowly spaced lines. On the front, along the fibres are five generously spaced lines of cursive with a high top margin (register? 1 -]ος τοῦ Χαυρήμονος τοῦ Ἀλεξί[-, 2 Ἐρμιόνης καὶ (?) [] in a largish script datable to the end of the first century. The script of the literary text is a fluent cursive, a rapidly written version of the Informal round type, with a slant to the left (note ι, λ, η). There is connection between some groups of letters, particularly from and into ε. The bottom half of c is virtually a diagonal (95, elsewhere somewhat more curved) with a strictly horizontal top added, insinuating an impression of rapidity. γ in three different shapes: (i) with tail looped at top and flaring out to the lower right to produce a c-like shape; (ii) V-shaped with closed loop at bottom; (iii) a shallow champagne-glass-like bowl balanced on a curved stem. α is a diagonal with attached loop at left. α formed similarly with a larger loop, i.e. its left angle rounded. η in the earlier form with the left member higher than the crossbar and right vertical (as also in the document on the front). Cursive ε formed in its lower part by diagonal connection stroke with curved top added, its mid-stroke unconnected to the inside. π distinctively connects to following letter with a horizontal stroke from beneath the bowl at baseline. ω has an additional stroke connecting at bottom with the following letter. The script shows some affinity with P. Lond. I 110 (*GLH* 18a, horoscope with date of birth 4 December 137, according to O. Neugebauer and H. B. van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes* (Philadelphia 1959) 40), but is written with a finer pen. More cursive but worth comparing is *GMAW*² 16 (Alcman, *Partheneia*, I AD assigned; cf. *ibid.* 60, *Aristot. Ath. Pol.*, late first century, with agricultural accounts of 78/9 on recto).

Punctuation is by mid-point and low point (95, where it marks weak pause). In two cases the scribe has placed circumflex accents and once an acute). Elision is effected in the two places where it is required and is not marked. Iota adscript, required in 104, is not written there, the only place where we expect it. The δ in ὑποδείξας (98), which has to be counted twice for metrical reasons, is only written once. Yet this need not be formally counted as an error: according to S. West, *Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Cologne and Opladen 1965) 113: ‘the Ptolemaic papyri support Aristophanes against Aristarchus in geminating the initial consonant. Except for rho, the Aristophanic practice is invariable in these papyri In Roman papyri both practices are found, sometimes in the same papyrus.’

Π³⁹ (XLV 3220) overlaps at 92–6 but contains different parts of the same lines.

ε]χετλιος ἦ που πολλα μ[ετ-
 ην ατην οχεων· η δ ου π[αλιναγρετος
 αυταρ εμοι δαιμων χαλ[επουσ
 95 ω φιλος. αλλα συ θααρον εχ[

ιππων ωκυπ[οδ]ων μεγα [
 ιθυσ εχειν θοο . αρμα και [
 μηδεν υποδειξας κτυπο[ν] Αρεο[ς
 ο[ς] νυν κεκληγω[ς] περ[ι]μ]αινεται [
 100 Φοιβου Απολλω[νος] εκατηβελε[ταο
 η μην και κρατ[ερο]ς [περ ε]ων . . [
 τ[ο]ν δ αυτε προσε[ειπ]εν αμωμ[ητος
 η]θ[ε]ι η̄ μαλά δ[η τι πα]τηρ α[νδρων
 τι]μα σην κ[ε]φ[αλην] και τα[υρεος
 105 ο]ς [Θ]ηβης κρη[δεμνον
 οιον δ]η και [

92 μ[ετ-]: μεταστοναχίζετ' m: μετεστεναχίζετ' A: μετεστοναχίζετ' Stobaeus 3.4.35.

93 οχέων: with B A J F Z R: ἀχέων b S Stob. Cf. *Od.* 21.302 with same variant. ὀχέων, present participle (intensive of ἔχων) is apparently the correct reading. ἀχέων could be interpreted as (i) genitive plural of ἄχος: but the genitive of definition does not otherwise occur with ἄτη in Homer or Hesiod; cf. *Il.* 6.356, 24.38 'Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἄτης (ἀχέων gen. pl. otherwise only at *Il.* 20.298 μὰψ ἔνεκ' ἀλλοτρίων ἀχέων, Hom. *hymn. Cer.* 436 ἀχέων δ' ἀπεπαύετο θυμός). (ii) = ἀχεύων present participle 'bewail', 'lament', easy enough with μετεστεναχίζετο in 92. But ἀχέων = ἀχεύων is used only with genitive of cause, with internal accusative, or absolutely. If we assume that in the present passage ἀχέων = ἀχεύων is used absolutely and that the accusative depends on μετεστεναχίζετο, we will have difficulties to construe the accusative at *Od.* 21.302 (at *Od.* 4.100 πάντας μὲν ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων the accusative depends on ὀδυρόμενος). (iii) = a form of ἰαχέω 'utter' (see Buttmann, *Lexilogus* ii² (Berlin 1860) 103; Richardson and Allen/Halliday on Hom. *hymn. Dem.* 479). This meaning is unsuitable in both *Od.* 21.302 and the present passage. Therefore the reading ἀχέων is to be rejected (as by most editors) in favour of ὀχέων, which suits grammar (it is transitive) and sense.

97 θοο . : θοὸν b S J F Z R: θοός B A. After θο there is the top of a round letter as ε, θ, ο, and after that just trace at level of the line which does not rule out either of the transmitted readings.

101 . . [: ἄται b B A J F Z R: ἄεται S: corrected to ἄται by Heyne. Solmsen compares Hsch. s.v. ἄται. The first trace is of an upright, the second a hook over left, not λ.

102 αμωμ[ητος]. No other reading is recorded. μ is largely obliterated, but there is ample space for it, also for ω which seems to show its characteristic connection stroke at bottom into the following letter; that letter, however, has a middle less deep than μ shows elsewhere, and there is unexplained ink beneath its left leg (as though part of the connecting stroke from ω).

103 μαλά: The ink over the second α appears to be an acute accent, but if so, it is misplaced.

106 και [: The first trace just a speck at level of the top-line, compatible with λ in the expected καί. The second trace, top of high oblique curving left above the top-line, could be top of ι curving into the vertical.

4665. HESIOD, *SCUTUM* 220–30

68 6B.20/D(5–8)b

2.7 × 5.8 cm

Late second/early third century

Part of the middle of a column from a papyrus roll written along the fibres. The back is blank. The script is an Informal round capital with much connection between letters and affinities with the Chancery Style, especially V-shaped γ with almost vertical left-hand side and flamboyant right arm arching up above the line and cursive κ (e.g. 227). The letters are slightly compressed vertically and show a slight inclination to the right. α with round left-hand part. Δ with hook over top left and extended to the right at base-line. μ with deep rounded middle. Punctuation is by high point (224: squeezed in after the line was written). Acute accent (224), by same scribe. There is no opportunity to observe whether the scribe effected or marked elision. The hand is very similar to, but not identical with IV 689 (containing *Scut.* 466–80, late second century, assigned), perhaps slightly later, judged from shapes of ε, γ. *GMAW*² 22 (XXVI 2441, Pindar, *Paeans*, second century, assigned) shows a similar hand written with slightly more formality. On literary texts in documentary, especially Chancery script, see T. Renner in *Pap. Cong. XXI* (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1997) ii 827–34, whose comparisons suggest a date late in the second or early third centuries.

220 χρυσε]ον αμ[φι
 ωμοις]ιν δε μιν [
 χαλκε]ου εκ τελα[μωνος
 παν δε] μεταφρενο[ν
 γοργου]ς· αμφι δε μ[ιν
 225 αργυρε]η θυκανοι δε [
 χρυσειοι] δειν[[ου]]η' . . [
 κειτ Αι]δος κυν[εη
 αυτος δε ς]πευδο[ντι
 Περσευς] Δανα[ιδης
 230 Γοργονες α]πλη[-

222 χαλκε]ου: with B J F Z, correctly: χάλκεον b S.

226 δειν[[ου]]η': The papyrus apparently had δεινου originally, subsequently corrected to δεινη, correctly. Apparently ο has been cancelled with a horizontal stroke through the middle, which extends into the ν (unless θ is to be read, copied by mistake from θν- in the previous line, with the horizontal interpreted as the cross-bar of θ extending to the right, as it does in 225). A smaller η has been added above ο, perhaps by the same scribe. δεινου (if it was the original reading) was probably intended to agree with ἀνακτος, in error.

. . . : After ου the right arm of γ may continue to form the top of Δ, but is not convincingly compatible with δε' as expected. The second trace is a speck of ink on a dangling fibre.

230 a]πλγ[: ἄπληστοι b S B J F Z R, adopted by most editors: ἄπληστοι *Et. Gen.* cod. A (deest B) s.v. μαπέειν. The papyrus does not decide. It shows tops of three letters: π is a high horizontal sagging in the middle; λ is an apex as of λ, Δ, λ; η is a mid-level horizontal with an upright extending above at right.

D. OBBINK

4666. HESIOD, *SCUTUM* 253–65, MISSING 259

8 1B.196/C(1–3)d front

5.1 × 10.9 cm

Late second/early third century
Plate VIII

Thirteen lines from the top of a column from a papyrus roll written along the fibres in a large bookhand. Judged from the height of letters (0.4 cm) and extant top margin (4.1 cm from the preserved, but apparently original top edge) this was a lavish if not quite deluxe production. On the back is a literary text, reserved for publication in volume LXIX, containing top of a column and ends of 18 lines from Lucian, *Dialogi deorum* 10.1–2, written in a smallish mannered cursive of the third century.

The script of *Scut.* is an upright Biblical Uncial of medium-to-large size showing more than slight decoration: vertical finials on the left side of top-stroke of τ and top of vertical of ψ and upper arm of κ; cf. the slight tick backward on the tops of verticals, notably on second vertical of η in 264 and 265. Shading is heavy (nib held roughly parallel to the fibres, so that horizontal strokes are thin and verticals thick). ω with vertical middle rising fully to the top line and broadly arcing sides leaving a rather flat bottom. μ in four strokes with a mid-level depression in the middle part (four strokes but deep to base-line in XXII **2334** = *GMAW*² 26, deep but rounded in three strokes in the Hawara Homer = *GMAW*² 13, second century, assigned). The script shows vertical extension of the tops of λ, Δ, λ resulting in an uplifting effect (note the effect overdone in the execution of λ in 257). The same effect may be seen in XVIII **2075** (*GMAW*² 11, Hesiodic *Catalogue*, assigned by Turner to the third century, to the late second century by Hunt) with which it compares well. The developing decoration suggests that progression from the later second century into the early third cannot be ruled out.

No evidence of punctuation (absent in the only place expected, but we do not have line-beginnings to show whether paragraphi were used). In the only place where we can tell, elision is effected but not marked. Iotacistic spelling (253 ει for long ι).

The hand is virtually identical (see below) to that which produced PSI IX 1087, containing along the fibres *Scut.* 273–89 (note same heavily shaded vertical decorative strokes placed delicately on the beginning and end of cross-bar of τ), dated to the second–third centuries by its editor Vitelli: see Pap. Flor. 12 (Suppl.) no. 245 tav. LXX and G. Cavallo et al., *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico*, Mostra di papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pap. Flor. 30 (Florence 1998) tav. XXXIII. In the latter publication the hand is dated by M. D’Agostino ‘al pieno secolo III senza ulteriori precisazioni’ (p. 120). Its letters are identical in height to those of the present papyrus; both papyri have top margins preserved to c.4 cm (though the heights of their respective columns are unknown). Their

in the measurements given above). *κε[μ]ενον* is suggested by spacing, confirmed by the reconstructed positions of the line-beginnings below.

νε. [: The surviving trace on the damaged edge is not certainly compatible with the transmitted *νεούτατον*, although the tradition records no variants here. The trace seems to show top of an upright in the upper left quadrant, with a diagonal connecting at the top as *μ* or *ν*, rather than the upper left quadrant of *ο* with stroke narrowing at top as elsewhere. But possibly the original shape is obscured by loss of ink at the edge.

Solmsen thought that a verse (e.g. *μάρναντο κρατερῶς μεγάλῳ εθένει, ἐν δ' ἄρ' ἐκάκτη*) might have dropped after 253.

254 *με[γ]αλου*: *γ* is aligned more or less just beneath the second *π* in 253. Thus there is space for 9–10 letters to have preceded. The tradition offers here *βάλλ' ὄνυχας*, which has been variously supplemented to complete the sense: *βάλλ(ον ὀμῶς)* van Lennep (printed by Solmsen); *βάλλ(ον ἔπειτ')* Hermann; 'haplogian *βάλλ' ὄν-* maluit E. Schwyzer'. The supplements necessitate the deletion of *Ἄιδόδε* later in the line for metrical reasons (so Hermann, though the line as written in the papyrus clearly had space for it), and various substitutions for *κατῆεν* (itself an emendation by Wolf: *κατεῖεν ο*) at line-end. It is uncertain whether the copying of a text of Lucian, *Dialogi deorum* 10.1 containing *ὄνυχας* on the back is related to its occurrence at *Scut.* 254 on the front, i.e. whether copied out as a lexical or textual parallel. It may simply be coincidental. In the text of *Scut.*, the Fates have not previously been said to be equipped with *ὄνυχες*; rather, they use their fangs (249 *λευκοὺς . . . ὀδόντας*) in order to drink the blood of humans. However *ὄνυχας* reappears at 263 (*ἐν δ' ὄνυχας χεῖράς τε θρασεῖας ἰσώσαντο*) and 266 in the description of 'Αχλὺς, 'Death' (*μακροὶ δ' ὄνυχες χεῖρεσσιν ὑπήσαν*), both in a passage (258–63) included in the papyrus text but often suspected of being a later addition.

256 *ανδρο]μεού' τον*: After *με* a small V-shaped *ν* has been added suprascript in a pen and ink very like that of the main scribe, although the shape is very different. *τ* is written as if originally *ι*, i.e. an upright in a letter space between *ο* and *ο*, of a width suitable for *ι* but too narrow for *τ*. If so, the scribe originally wrote *οιον* after *ανδρο(?)]* *με*, then added *ν* above and changed *ι* to *τ* by adding an asymmetrical top-stroke.

258–63 were deleted by Kuenneth, and Schwarz similarly thought them to have been added by an interpolator. The papyrus shows their presence here (with the exception of 259).

258–60: 259 *Ἄτροπος οὐ τι πέλεν μεγάλη θεός, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἦ γε* is attested by the other witnesses, but is not present here. Both 259 and its surrounding lines have often been suspected. According to West as reported by Solmsen (app. crit. ad loc.), 258 might have originally ended *ἀλλ' ἄρα ἦ γε*, while 259 might have ended with *ἦ μὲν ὑφῆσσων*, but the portion of the lines witnessed by the papyrus offers no evidence on this matter.

D. OBBINK

4667. HYMNI HOMERICI, XVIII 4–11, VII 1–11

18 2B.64/H(2)(a)

3.2 × 13.2 cm

Third century
Plate VI

A narrow strip from a roll (writing along the fibres and back blank) carrying middle parts of Homeric Hymns 18 and 7, the shorter hymns to Hermes and Dionysus respectively. The script is an example of the Severe Style at its mature stage, slanting slightly to the right; descenders with gentle leftward curves at the foot, **Δ** with base horizontal tending to ascend to the right, **ν** with broad diagonal joining the right vertical slightly above the foot, **ω** flat-based. A third-century date may be assigned.

The lectional signs in evidence consist of an apostrophe marking an elision, a high point serving punctuation purposes, two grave accents, a diaeresis, and a hyphen (sublinear). All are probably the work of the original scribe, who also seems to be responsible for the correction in 13 (HH 7.7). Iota adscript is written in the single observable case.

Only a handful of papyri of Homeric hymns have been published: XXIII **2379** (HH 2.402–7) (III), IV **670** (III), and P. Gen. III 118 (II/I BC); for the last two see M. L. West, ‘The Fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus’, *ZPE* 134 (2001) 1–11, though cf. A. Dihle, ‘Zu den Fragmenten eines Dionysos-Hymnus’, *RhM* 145 (2002) 427–30. Cf. also BKT V.1 2, quoting verses from HH 2. It should be noted that the hand of **2379** is similar to but not the same as that of **4667**.

The text has been collated with the editions of T. W. Allen (1912) and F. Càssola (1975). There are a number of odd novelties. The order of the hymns in the papyrus, with HH 7 following HH 18, does not seem to have been attested otherwise. It is possible that we have a new closure to HH 18, and a new version of the title of HH 7, but it is perhaps more likely that a prose text comes between the two hymns, in which case we may consider whether we have a fragment of a prose work quoting the two hymns. See further 9 n. and 10 n.

This papyrus has been referred to, in advance of publication, by M. L. West in his Loeb edition of the *Homeric Hymns* (Cambridge, Mass. 2003), with the siglum *IT*³.

	θυγατη]ρ Δι[ο]ς εϋ [xviii 4
] δε θεω[ν	5
	ναιεταου]α πολυ[ρκιω	6
	ευπλοκα]μωι μι]ς[γρεσκετο	7
5	υ]πνος ε[χοι	8
	αθαν]ατους τε [9
	χ]αιρε Διος κ[αι	10
	αρξ]αμ]ενος μετα[βησομαι	11
] . αι εστι δ . [
10] τον υμν[
	Σ]εμελης [vii 1
	εφα]νη πα[ρα	2
] νε]η[[ι]ν[ιη	3
] περι]σσειοντο	4
15	δ]ε περι]στιβ[αροις	5
] δ' ανδρε]ς	6
	προ]γενο]ντο θω]ς [7
	-γ]ε κακος μ]ο]ρος	8
	αλλη]λους τα]χα	9
20	σφετε]ρης νη]ο]ς	10
	εφα]ντο διο]τρ]εφεων	11

3 (HH 18.6) πολυ[ρκιω with J: παλιρκίω all other MSS. The banalisation attested in J may now be shown to have its roots in antiquity.

7–9 HH 18 as transmitted ends:

καὶ εὖ μὲν οὕτω χαίρει, Διὸς καὶ Μαϊάδος νιέ,	10
σεῦ δ' ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον.	11
χαίρ' Ἐρμῆ χαριδῶτα, διάκτορε, δῶτορ ἑάων.	12

HH 18.2–9 reproduce HH 4 (the longer Hymn to Hermes) 2–9 with minor variations, while HH 18.10–11 correspond to HH 4.579–80 (10 verbatim, 11 in substance). HH 18.12 has no parallel in the longer hymn, and it has been possible to regard 10–11 (del. West) and 12 (del. Ilgen) as doublets. The papyrus certainly contained 10–11. Its next line (9) did not offer any recognizable form of verse 12.

9] .αι εετι δ. [: On the left-hand edge, the right-hand tip of a high horizontal, i.e. ρ or τ, less likely π. After] .αι, there is apparently space for word-division. Then, it is hard to read ξ in place of the putative ζ (*Ἐετία* would be a very difficult reading); the left-hand oblique and remains of the base horizontal do not form the characteristic sharp lower left angle of ξ. At the end of the line, remains of an upright slanting to right, joining a curved top at upper right: in the context, this may be ε, though ρ cannot be excluded entirely (but ι is not possible).

10] cov ὕμν[: 11 ff. contain the beginning of HH 7, the shorter Hymn to Dionysus. 10 might then be read as a title to this. The MSS give: τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς Διόνυσον M; εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον ρ; Διόνυκος ἦ λησταί x D ed. pr. One may consider reading εἰς Διόνυ]cov ὕμν[oc, though the word order is not the expected one.

Another possibility is that 9 and 10 belong together, and contain prose, perhaps a prose transition from the one hymn to the other. But if we are dealing with a prose work that quoted the Hymns, we would hardly expect them to be quoted in extenso, whereas here it is clear that HH 18 was copied complete, and of HH 7 at least the first part. But then again, we would not expect hexameters quoted in such a work to be written in full line-width. And would the prose have been written in hexameter-length lines? One may of course hypothesize that the prose was written in *eisthesis* and in shorter lines, cf. the layout of the Lille Callimachus (*GMAW*² 75).

13 (HH 7.3) νεή[[ι]ν[ιη: νεηνίη codd. plerique: νεανίη ET. The scribe initially seems to have written νεηι as a dative, then (*currente calamo?* or someone else later?) crossed ι through and clarified the articulation by adding grave accents, to indicate that the syllables bearing them were not accented, and a sublinear hyphen. Also, a dot was added above ι; it may be of the expunging kind, supplementing the role of the cancelling stroke (cf. e.g. *Il.* 6.99 in P. Lond. Lit. 13, reproduced in *ZPE* 112 (1996) Taf. X). Another dot was written at the top left of the second gravis, so that the latter now appears flanked by two dots. One may consider whether the two dots cancel the second gravis, but there is no obvious reason why this should be so. If the two dots are to be taken separately, the function of the dot placed before the gravis is unclear.

18 (HH 7.8) -γ]ε: ηγε ρ; ηγαγε all other mss. Considerations of space, supported by a tracing, suggest that the papyrus had ηγ]ε.

N. GONIS

4668. [HOMER,] *BATRACHOMYOMACHIA* 41, 53–8

39 3B.76/B(1)a

Fr. 1 3 × 3.7 cm
Fr. 2 2 × 5.2 cm

Late second / early third century

Two fragments, broken on all sides, from a roll containing documents on the front and remnants of eight lines with vv. 41, 53–8 of the *Batrachomyomachia* on the back. They seem to be the first attestation on papyrus of this mock epic, which in all probability was composed in the Hellenistic period and was later ascribed to Homer. Another, but more ancient, Homeric apocryphon, the burlesque *Margites*, has appeared in Oxyrhynchus in three separate copies (XXII 2309, LIX 3963, 3964).

The manuscript tradition of the *Batrachomyomachia* is bewildering, and most editors have doubted the possibility of reaching the original text. The edition of A. Ludwich (Leipzig 1896) gives full collations of seventy-five manuscripts; T. W. Allen, *Homeri Opera* v (Oxford [OCT] 1912) 161 ff., provides a more selective apparatus, based on Ludwich but with some further collations of his own. Recent editors have agreed in distinguishing two branches of the tradition far enough apart to count as different recensions: *a* (= PQYT) and *l* (= LJF), of which *l* is heavily interpolated. (See most recently M. L. West, *Homeric Hymns; Homeric Apocrypha; Lives of Homer* (Cambridge, Mass./London [LCL] 2003) 232–9, with mention of this papyrus on p. 232.) The edition of R. Gleis, *Die Batrachomyomachie: Synoptische Edition und Kommentar* (Frankfurt 1984) publishes recension *a* and recension *l* on facing pages, and cites six other manuscripts which he believes to contaminate the two traditions, including the earliest, Z (tenth century).

In collating this papyrus, we have used Gleis's sigla and apparatus, but added some information from Allen; the supplements printed *exempli gratia* come from the text of *a* as printed by Gleis. Our fragments seem to side mostly with *a*; it omits 42–52, included in *l*, but generally considered as a Byzantine interpolation. Cf. H. Wölke, *Untersuchungen zur Batrachomyomachie* (Meisenheim a. Glan 1978) 19 and 40 n. 112.

It is disconcerting that the tops of letters that survive of line 8 at the bottom edge of the papyrus appear not to accord with the expected v. 59, ἀμφίβιον γὰρ ἔδωκε νομὴν (ζωήν *a*) βατράχοις Κρονίων, nor has a computer search of possible three- or four-letter combinations (see 8 n.) placed the line anywhere else in the *Batrachomyomachia*.

The text has been copied in an average-sized upright round informal hand written rather cursorily. ε, θ, ο and c are narrow, μ and λ rather large, while x has serifs at its lower extremities. In general appearance the hand somewhat resembles that of XXVI 2441 (= *GMAW*² 22) which has been assigned to the second century. However, the script of 4668 is less bilinear and shows more ligatures and in general more documentary influence. We are inclined to assign it to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. There are no accents, punctuation, or other lectional signs.

The front of fr. 1 contains remnants of 6 lines in a second-century documentary hand. The front of fr. 2 has traces of 5 lines in a different and much thinner documentary hand. Fr. 2, however, is composed of two layers stuck together, which we have not risked trying to separate. The different hand on the back of fr. 2 may indicate a repair patch, or fr. 2 is from a kollesis made when discarded documents were assembled in a roll, or we are dealing with a *tomos synkollesimos*.

	κ]οσμουντες χυτρ[ας αρτυμασι παντοδαποισιν	41
	ο]υ τρωγω ρεφαν[ας ου κ]ραμ[βα]ς [ου κολοκυνθας	53
	ου]δε πρασοις χλ[ωροις] επιβ[ο]ς[κομαι ουδε σελινοις	54
	ταυτα γα]ρ υμετε[ρ] ες]τιν εδεσμα[τα των κατα λιμνην	55
5]. ταδε μ[ειδης]ας Φυσιγ[ναθος αντιον ηυδα	56

ξεινε λιην αυχεις ε]πι γαστερ[ι εστι και ημιν 57
 πολλα γαρ εν λιμνη κ]αι επι χθο[νι θαυματ ιδεσθαι 58
 c.15] [

2 (53) ρεφαγ[ac with *a* (YΓ¹): ραφάνους *a* (PY) *l*.

3 (54) ου]δε with *a* (QT) X Z: οδ *a* (PY) *l*.

πράσιος with *a* *l* (XS²): τεύτλοις *l*, except τλεύτλοις F [so Gleis; Allen gives τεύτλοις for this MS, = V³] and
 ceύτλοις S.

4 (55) υμετε[ρ with *a*: ὑμῶν *l*.

5 (56)] ταδε: πρὸς τὰδε *a* *l*: πρὸς ταῦτα Z (and many others; see Allen): πρὸς ταῦτα δέ X (so Ludwig): ταῦτα δέ V¹³ marg. (so Allen). In the papyrus, the first trace suggests γ rather than c, and the spacing suggests word division between *a* and δ. τα]ῦτα δέ would suit these indications, and the metre, but leave a space of c.4 letters at the line beginning. It seems then that the papyrus may have had πρὸς τα]ῦτα δέ. If so, it is remarkable to find this unmetrical reading attested so early.

6 (57) Unidentifiable trace, below τ in 5 (56). Washed-out letter between ι and γ.

7 (58) επι χθο[νι with *a* X: ἐν χθονί *l*.

8 These traces pose a puzzle; see introd. Tops of six or seven letters are visible. The first trace is no more than a speck. A tall vertical, rather paler than the ink elsewhere, suggests φ as the second letter. Next, α or less likely γ. Next, linked c1 or κ. Then a rounded top, most likely ο or c, but ε or θ might also be possible. The last trace, a high horizontal turning sharply down and backwards at its right end, I cannot explain other than as z (if so, θ before is excluded, and obviously there are other impossible combinations).

A. WOUTERS

III. SUBLITERARY TEXTS

a. SCRIBAL PRACTICE AND DRAFT

4669. WRITING EXERCISE

26 3B.53/D (1-3) b

14.5 × 4.2 cm

First/second century?
Plate IX

On one side of this piece, small remains of two columns (line-ends and beginnings only), written along the fibres in a literary script; the line-ends are regular enough to suggest prose. There may be a sheet-join, which would prove that this was the original recto, but the surface is too damaged for certainty. The writing, so far as one can judge from this small sample, belongs to the first century AD or later: note the capital **Α**, and the wide **τ**, with its stem sometimes written in one movement with the left-hand part of the horizontal, sometimes as a curve descending from the right-hand end of the horizontal.

On the other side, also along the fibres, writing practice in two scripts. The original right-hand margin may survive; the papyrus is broken off on the other three sides. Lines 2 and 4 are the same, the end of a hexameter which has a clear likeness to, but is not identical with, several surviving verses. Line 3 has not been identified.

Line 3 represents a large, heavily shaded round hand, suggesting a primitive Biblical Uncial but differing from the 'canon' in its ornamental serifs and the forms of **Α** (capital, cross-bar horizontal) and of **ρ** (the second example, at least, curtailed to fit the bilinear space). Compare XVIII **2169**, assigned to the late second century by Lobel and to the early third by Cavallo (*Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* i 31 with tav. 9b). The letters average 10 mm in height, twice the size of Cavallo's largest examples: practical as practice, but not for actual book-production.

Lines 2 and 4 show a smaller more oval hand of the same general type, the ornamentation very conspicuous, suggesting a primitive version of the Roman Uncial (notice **ε** with closed top); **Α** with long pointed nose, as used for initials in documents, takes away from the ambitious intention. The closed **ε** and pointed **Α** (but not so exaggeratedly pointed as here) appear in other texts identified by Cavallo, *ASMP*, ser. 2, 36 (1967) 212f., as precursors of the canonical Roman Uncial (for similar scripts with closed **ε** add XLVII **3325**, XXXVII **2818**, XXXII **2623**). He assigns them to the mid-first century, others have opted for late first or first/second; we have no objectively dated item to act as signpost (the best is P. Fay. 7, *GLH* 9b, found with documents of Augustan date, but that is much squarer and more awkward). Thus attempts to date the two styles lead to widely disparate results.

The interest of **4669** lies not in dating, but in its significance for scribal training. The three lines are regularly arranged, and could come from the same pen. On the face of it, then, we see one scribe practising on one page alternative versions of the formal round

style — versions that anticipate the two formal round book-hands of the second century. Whether the sense of tentativeness says something about the date, or just about the writer's dexterity, remains unclear.

.
]..[]...[].[]
] . ΟΝΕΟΙΚΟΤΕCΑΙΘ . . . CΙΝ []
] ΡΟΝΟΡΟCΛΑ . []
] ΟΝΕΟΙΚΟΤΕCΑΙΘΥΙ . CΙ []
]. []

1 Specks only.

2], κ or χ. θ . . . , first, ink level with letter-tops and then point at line-level; third, apparent foot of upright and then another hooked to the right at the base.

2 and 4 combine to give] . ον εοικότες αιθυίην. Plainly a hexameter end, but not identical with any transmitted line. Compare:

Il. 7.59 ἐξέεθην ὄρνικιν εοικότες αἰγυπιοῖσιν

Od. 5.337, 353 / αἰθυίη (δ) εἰκνία

'Hom.' *Ep.* 8.2 [ed. D.B. Monro, 1896] πτωκάειν αἰθυίησι βίον δύεζήλον ἔχοντες [so *Vita Herodotea* 263; -ειν ἰὸν *Vita Suidae* 132]

AR 4.966 --- ἀλίγκιαι αἰθυίην

Aratus, *Phaen.* 296 --- ἴκελοι δὲ κολυμβίειν αἰθυίην.

At the beginning,]κον or]χον. Perhaps a verb, and a verse on the pattern of εἰναλίαις ἴζε[κον εοικότες αἰθυίην. QS 8.89 . . . ὑπόεικον εοικότες

3 λλ . [, λ clear; assuming that further ink (or stains) to the upper right is accidental; at the end, the upper arc of a round letter. Therefore not καί, which would have fitted HHApoll. 17 κεκλιμένη πρὸς μακρὸν ὄρος καὶ Κύνθιον ὄχθον or the like (AR 4.323, Orph. Arg. 1123). If this is another hexameter, we might expect the caesura to fall in or just before the preserved letters. QS 13.488 ἡντ' ὄρος λαίηνων ἄδην καταειμένον ὕλης does not suit this pattern.

4 1 . , an upright with its foot hooked to the left; an upright with its foot hooked to the right. η is expected, but I see no trace of the cross-bar, unless it lay in the narrow band of damaged fibres visible at one-third height.

P. J. PARSONS

4670. NOTICE

40 5B.116/H(1-5)a

15 × 13 cm

Fourth century
Plate IX

On one side of this piece, and written along the fibres, we have the foot of a column of accounts (3]ριω αρτοκοπω . [, 5] . ιω (τάλλ.) α (δρ.) Ἀς). Line 2 provides the date]κς και ιθ και ι . [, i.e. 20 Diocletian and 19 Maximian (before 19 Maximian was changed to 20; see Bagnall and Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* 70), AD 303-4.

On the other side, and also written along the fibres, is a notice in large ambitious letters, set off by substantial margins above and to the left and right; three lines, plus traces of a fourth line where the papyrus breaks off at the foot. The left edge, and part of the right, may be original; the top edge too is broken, so that in theory there might have been more matter above the present margin.

‘Good luck to Pergamios: have a good day.’ What kind of notice was this? It might be a doodle, and elaborately written for that reason. It might be a covering note for a (birthday?) present: compare the bottle-top in the Ashmolean, presumably from a wedding gift, which carries the ink inscription *εὐτυχῶς τῇ νύμφῃ καὶ [τ]ῷ νυμφίῳ* (O. Ashm. Shelton 196). It might be a draft for a poster or placard: for a private individual? or for some public personality (*εὐτυχῶς* regularly in acclamations, see 1 note, and regularly attached to *ἐπιδημεῖν* in reference to visits of officials, e.g. VIII **1103** 4 [= WChr 465], XII **1456** 9).

The script is in intention bilinear, with the notional parallels emphasized by ornament (blobs, hooks, serifs) at top and bottom. *ε* in three movements; *μ* straight-sided, the bow angular; *γ* in two movements, the strokes crossing close to the base-line; *ω* wide, in three movements, with only a small central concavity.

The most striking feature is alpha in the capital shape, its cross-bar in the form of a *V* (two movements?) almost touching the base-line. This form, the ‘broken-bar alpha’, certainly has a long history in stone-inscriptions. It goes back at least to the later third century BC (M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca* i (1967) 380; Stephen V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 BC* (1990) 238), and continues common in Late Antique inscriptions (cf. **4671**). For Egypt, Dr W. E. H. Cockle refers me to his discussion in D. M. Bailey, *Catalogue of the Lamps . . .* iv (1996) 1–2, where he quotes dated examples from the inscriptions in Breccia, *Catalogue générale*; he notes also numerous examples in F. Kayser, *Recueil des Inscriptions grecques et latines (non funéraires) d’Alexandrie impériale (I^{er}–III^e s. apr. J.-C.)*. It seems natural to think that those who use this shape in pen-writing aim at monumental effect. Compare the ‘lapidary A’ of the ‘Order of Peukestas’ (Turner, *GMAW*² no. 79, and *SC* 4 (1980) 26), but there the cross-bar is more cursively written as a single concave stroke.

ΕΥΤΥΧΩΣ
ΠΕΡΓΑΜΙΩ
ΚΑΛΗΗΜΕΡΑ
Τ [

¹ *εὐτυχῶς* could be used absolutely, as e.g. in VIII **1108** 1 (6th/7th century) as heading to a list of officials. But it is often linked to a dative, as e.g. in the reconstructed colophon of the school-book P. Bouriant 1 (R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (1996) no. 393) *γένειτο ε]ὐτυχῶς τῶι [τοῦτο ε]χοντι καὶ τῶι [σπουδῆι ἀν]αγιγνώσκοντι κτλ.* (cf. *εὐτυχῶς τῶι γράψαντι καὶ τῶι ἀναγιγνώσκοντι* in Christian epitaphs). One common use is in acclamations: I **41** = WChr 45 *εὐτυχῶς τῶι καθολικῶι* etc.; XLVII **3340** 15; O. Mich I 663.

² *Περγαμίω*. The name is not uncommon in itself. If we look for a grandee to be acclaimed, I find only

Flavius Pompeius Pergamius, *praeses Thebaidis* 375–6 (*PLRE* i 688, tentatively identified with the *Comes Orientis* Pergamius attested in the 380s). The date suits; but Oxyrhynchus is not obviously in his jurisdiction.

3 *καλή ἡμέρα*: presumably nominative. This is the earliest example I have found of the phrase, which reappears as Modern Greek *καλημέρα*. This too might attract a dative: compare Constantine Porphyrogenitus *de caerimoniis* i p. 599 and often, the court greeting *καλή ἡμέρα ὑμῶν, ἄρχοντες*.

P. J. PARSONS

4671. TABULA ANSATA

100/171(a)

11 × 4.7 cm

Fifth century?
Plate X

This scrap probably preserves the original edges to the left and at the foot, but is broken off, quite neatly, above and to the right. Written across the fibres, although the back is blank. The writing was enclosed in an outline *tabula ansata*, of which the lower left corner remains; the surviving word was followed by a Greek cross drawn in double outline (the extremities expanded by trapezoidal finials), whose upright is now halved by the break. If we can assume symmetry, the original *tabula* must have been about 5 cm high, and the strip about 7 cm high, with room only for the one line of writing; the original width cannot be estimated, since we do not know whether the cross ended the text, or served as a divider. The size certainly suggests an independent item, rather than (say) the title or end-title of a book, though the *tabula* form is known also from such contexts (e.g. XVII **2084** end).

The surviving word, *Ἀρκαδιης*, is written in rough capitals about one cm high. The writing is irregular; some strokes have been overwritten, giving a blotchy effect, and the lower line of the frame was written in consecutive shorter strokes, badly joined and sometimes overlapping. Only one letter-form is really notable: the alpha with V-shaped cross-bar, on which see **4670** introduction.

The cross points to a date in the Christian period. The only other clue is the name, which might in principle refer (1) to a person or (2) to the Egyptian province or more remotely (3) to old Arcadia in Greece. As to (1), the name is not uncommon; but Dr Gonis points especially to the princess (daughter of the emperor Arcadius) who owned estates in the Oxyrhynchite nome (*P. Med.* II 64, AD 440, cf. **4688** 2 n.; L **3582**, AD 442; *PLRE* ii 129). As to (2), the province, of which Oxyrhynchus was the capital, was created at some time between 386 and 397/9; see LXIII **4385** introd. [p. 94]. But there is the further question of the function of this piece. The script, the frame, and the cross suggest an inscription (in itself, or as a draft for a stone-cutter). The Ionic ending *-ης* might suggest verse; that is not to be relied on, see Gignac ii 3 f. for *-α/-ης* in documentary texts of the Roman and early Byzantine period. Should we think of an inscription honouring Arcadia or a governor of Arcadia? or (as Dr Coles suggests) of a draft, or substitute, mummy-label?

⌈ ἈΡΚΑΔΙΗΣ ⌋

P. J. PARSONS

b. MAGIC

4672. EROTIC MAGICAL FORMULARY

84/59 (a)

10.6 × 13.5 cm

Third/fourth century
Plate X

This love spell belongs to the type ἀγωγὴ ἀγρυπνητική, designed to cause the beloved insomnia until she consents. A number of comparable texts belong to this category: PGM IV 2944–66, VII 374–6 (incantation with a seashell, cf. 4674 1 and n.), XII 376–96, LII 20–6; cf. C. A. Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge, Mass. 1999) 26 n. 114, 65–6. Δ stands for δεῖνα (see 3 note), which replaces the personal names of the people involved in the actual spell and indicates that 4672 was a formulary, i.e. used as a model in copying spells (see 3 n.). Note the *addenda lexicis* in 5, 10–11.

The spell is written in a rather informal hand with sporadic ligatures, slightly slanting to the right, roughly bilinear, apart from the uprights of ι, ρ, τ, φ and the letter ξ, which tends to protrude above and below the baseline. Ornamentation is not particularly emphasized; however, it is worth noting that the lower extremities of uprights often have a leftward hook, except for the right-hand uprights of η and π, which have a rightward hook. Not dissimilar is the hand of XLVIII 3368 (Menander, *Misoumenos*), assigned to the third century.

No accents. Diaeresis in 4 (visible above lost letter). In 1, 2, 10, and 11 there are short diagonal strokes high in the line (indicated by ' in the text below), functioning as word- or sense- or cola-dividers; cf. 4674 and 1 n. below. An itacistic spelling occurs in line 2. After 15 there is a forked paragraphus, presumably marking end of the spell.

Written along the fibres; the back is blank. On the right, a few letters before line-ends, there is a kollesis. The upper margin is partially preserved for 1.4 cm; the left margin is preserved for 1 cm. The line ends run to the edge of the sheet.

Νὺξ Ἐκάτη Ἐκάτη δέ μου ἄγγελος
 ἔστω 'καὶ πορευθεῖσα καὶ σταθίσα
 πρὸς κεφαλῆς τῆς δ(εῖνος) ἧς ἔτεκεν
 ἢ δ(εῖνα) περιέλε αὐτῆς τὸν [ῥ]πνον
 5 ἕως ἐξαπατηδήσασα ἔλθη πρὸς
 ἐμέ τὸν δ(εῖνα) τῆς δ(εῖνος) φιλοῦτά με καὶ ἀ-
 γαπῶτά με καὶ ζητ[οῦς] ἀ μὲν τῆ(ν)
 συνουσίαν ἐπὶ τὸν τῆ[ς ζω]ῆς αὐ-
 τῆς χρόνον ατρακ[2-3]τα
 10 τρακα ἑτετρακύων ἑτετρ[α]υ-

λάκτ[α]’ ἀγρυπνειτ[.] . . . [2–3]
 φι[λοῦδά μ]ε καὶ ἀγαπῶ[δά με τὸν δ(εῖνα)]
 τῆς [δ(εῖνος) καὶ ζητοῦ[ῦδά μου τῆν]
 ζυν[ουσία]ν ἐπ[ὶ τὸν τῆς ζωῆς]
 15 αὐ[τῆς πάντα χρόνον]

1 μου’: right-hand side of γ extended in separate movement 2 l. σταθεῖα 3, 4, 6 Δ; l. ἦν
 7 τῆ’ 4 [’] 9 After χρόνον blank 1 cm wide

‘Night, Hecate, let Hecate be my messenger, and hurry up and stand beside the head of NN, whom NN bore, and take the sleep from her until she jumps up and comes to me NN, whom NN bore, loving me and desiring me and seeking intercourse with me for the duration of her life. (*Voces magicae*) with four dog-faces, fourfold barker, let NN, whom NN bore(?), be sleepless, loving me and desiring me NN, whom NN bore, and seeking intercourse with me for all the duration of her life.’

1 For Νύξ invoked as a goddess in an erotic context cf. the opening of Men., *Mis.* ὦ Νύξ, εὐ γὰρ δὴ πλείστον Ἀφροδίτης μέρος / μετέχεις θεῶν, belonging to the well-known *topos* of the lover addressing the night or other natural elements to confess his love-sufferings (Plaut. *Mer.* 3 ff. *non ego item facio ut alios in comediis / <vis> vidī amoris facere, qui aut Nocti aut Die / aut Soli aut Lunae miserias narrant suas*); cf. also P. Ant. I 15.4–7, probable comedy by Menander (see W. G. Arnott, *ZPE* 125 (1999) 61–4), A. W. Gomme, F. H. Sandbach, *Menander: A Commentary* (1973) 442, and D. Del Corno, ‘Due note sulla commedia nuova: 2. Il motivo dell’invocazione alla notte nella commedia nuova’, *Grazer Beiträge* 9 (1980) 72–7.

Hecate is one of several deities whose worship is connected with ἀγωγὴ spells; see Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* 133. Hecate is here associated with Νύξ (cf. PGM IV 2855 ff., a comparable series of invocations in a prayer to Selene which occupies lines 2785–890, and Suppl. Mag. I 49 back 64–74). This is consistent with her frequent assimilation with Persephone, Selene and Artemis by syncretism (see e.g. Suda, s.v. Ἐκάτη· οἱ μὲν Ἀρτεμιν, οἱ δὲ Ἐλήνην, PGM IV 2815–25); note the epithet τετρακόρη referred to Hecate in G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Berlin 1878) 406.11; cf. Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* 141–2, and S. I. Johnston, *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1999) 203–49. With regard to the relationship with the night, note also the epithets νυκταιροδύτεια (PGM IV 2546), νυκτιβόη (PGM IV 2808), and νυχία (PGM VII 882).

For the short diagonal strokes functioning as word- or sense-dividers, here and in 2, 10 and 11, cf. LV 3812 5 n. Add PSI I 65, cf. M. Manfredi, *Miscellanea Papirologica Ramon Roca-Puig* 185; Cavallo and Maehler, *GBEP* no. 4b, LVI 3825 introd. para. 3, 3827 introd. para. 2, 3842, 3843, LX 4022, LXVII 4554, T. Varie XVIII 9, P. Leid. Inst. no. 5 at p. 8, n. 2 (with more), no. 16 at p. 93 (at ends of sentences), as well as 4674.

ἄγγελος. The function and the representation of Hecate as an ἄγγελος, in connection with her aspect as a chthonic deity (i.e. as mediator between the human world and the underworld) is well attested in classical literature: see e.g. H. h. Cer. 52 ἀγγελέουσα. ἄγγελος as an alternative name for her is attested in Sophron, *PCG* i Sophron fr. *7 Ἐκάτα . . . ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῆ θέσθαι Ἀγγελον; cf. Hesych. s.v., who refers the name to Artemis as worshipped in Syracuse Ἀγγελον Κυρακούσιοι τῆν Ἀρτεμιν λέγουσιν; cf. Audollent, *DT* nos. 74–5; see also F. Sokolowski, ‘Sur le culte d’angelos dans le paganisme grec et romain’, *HTR* 53 (1960) 225–9. In 4672 Hecate is summoned to be the personal messenger of the performer, i.e. the actual agent of the spell. This seems to be fully consistent with the fact that in magical papyri both ἄγγελοι and δαίμονες are invoked to perform spells without any clear distinctions, and often are qualified as ‘gods’, as in PGM I 42–195, where the invoked ἄγγελος is also referred to as ‘the god’ throughout the text (cf. J. G. Gager, *Curse Tablets* (New York and Oxford 1992) 12).

It has to be observed that Hecate is mentioned in the third person singular in 1–2, but addressed in the second

person of the imperative (περίελε) in 4. For such a switch one may compare the ἀγωγή in PGM IV 2441–621, where Hecate is summoned first in the third person (2471–4) and then in the second person (2484–92).

The text from Νύξ το ἔστω (1–2) presents a dactylic rhythm. (The diagonal dividing-strokes might be relevant, i.e. marking metrical cola or cadences?) A hexametric pattern appears in a number of magical papyri: PGM III 550–8, IV 2714–83 (hymn in dactylic hexameters), LII 2–4; cf. Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* 142–6. Metrical sections in magical texts often present oddities and irregularities due to the ignorance of the scribe and/or mistakes in the process of copying from models; see Faraone, *CP* 90 (1995) 13; D. R. Jordan, *ZPE* 72 (1988) 245–59, esp. 256–7; W. M. Brashear, ‘The Greek Magical Papyri’, in *ANRW* II.18.5, 3420–2; cf. *Suppl. Mag.* II 71 fr. 22.4, p. 105 n., LXV **4468** verso col. i 1–17, 18–26 nn.

2ff. Cf. PGM IV 2735–6 *στάντες ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς τῆς δείνα ἀφέ|λεσθε αὐτῆς τὸν γλυκὺν ὕπνον.*

3 Cf. 4, 6, etc. For the symbol Δ cf. e.g. LXV **4468** and LXVIII **4674**. It is used to indicate the person performing the spell and his target in magical handbooks, as in PGM I 254 and 261, II 341 and 567 (the magician), IV 3013 (the person exorcised). In the actual performance of the spell, it was to be replaced by the personal names of the people involved, i.e. the practitioner and the target. Texts such as **4672** were used as models by scribes who often copied the individual spells leaving a blank space (instead of Δ) to be filled later with the personal names of the peoples involved in the charm, so that they may subsequently look cramped and crowded, as in the inscribed gold phylactery published by C. A. Faraone and R. Kotansky, *ZPE* 75 (1988) 257–66, at 257; see F. Maltomini, *ZPE* 66 (1986) 160, and Audollent, *DT* no. 230.

5 ἔξαπατηθήσασα: *hapax*; the simpler compound ἀναπηδάω occurs only once in magical papyri, PGM I 93 (ἀνεπήδησε, referred to a deity), while ἐκπηδάω occurs in a number of comparable erotic spells, PGM XIXa 51, XXXVI 71, *Suppl. Mag.* I 40.18, 42.17 and 38, 45.46, 48J 10.

9–10 Sequence of *voces magicae*? The following word τετρακύων (10) is not attested elsewhere. It suggests an epithet for Hecate, the deity addressed in 1. The association of Hecate with dogs is well attested, both in literary sources and in magical papyri. In Eur. *TGF*² 968 the dog is defined Ἐκάτης ἄγαλμα φωσφόρου. Hecate is represented as surrounded by dogs in Apoll. Rhod. III 1216–7, Lycophron 1176, Hor. S. i.8.35, Verg. *Aen.* 6.257; dogs form her cortège (*TrGF* II Adesp. F 375), and she is qualified by epithets like κυνηγέτις (Orph. *h.* 36.5), κυνλακάγεια (PGM IV 2722), κυνλακίτις (Orph. *h.* 1.5, 36.12), φιλοσκύλαξ (Nonn. *Dionys.* 3.74), and summoned as κύων μέλαινα (PGM IV 1434), ἰσπαρθένος κύων (PGM IV 2251) and κυνώ (PGM IV 2279); cf. also *Suppl. Mag.* II 57 1 n., where the epithet προκύνη referred to Hecate may be interpreted as ‘dog-leader’, and S. I. Johnston, *Hekate Soteira* (Atlanta 1990) 134–42 (chapter IX ‘The Chaldean Daemon-dogs’). For artistic representation see *LLMC* VI.1 994–5. Note also that the praxis of a love-spell in PGM IV 1872–1927 involves the use of wax images of dogs (cf. PGM IV 2943–66). For a full examination of the association of Hecate with dogs see D. Colomo, ‘Ecate, Anubi e i cani negli incantesimi erotici su papiro’, paper delivered at the XXIII International Congress of Papyrology (Vienna, July 2001), forthcoming in the *Akten* of that congress.

The basic sense of τετρακύων might be ‘with four dogs’, ‘accompanied by four dogs’. However, τετρα- is the first element of epithets of Hecate in PGM IV 2817–18, τετραπρόσωπε and τετραοδίτις, the latter referring to her function of protecting *quadriua*. This suggests an alternative and more striking translation of τετρακύων, ‘with four dog-faces’. Cf. *τετρ[α]υλάκτ[α]* following, and Ov. *Fast.* 1.141–2 *ora vides Hecates in tres vertentia partes, servet ut in ternas compita secta vias*, where the statue of Hecate *triformis* at the street junction presents a face looking in each of the three directions.

Epithets for Hecate with the numeral three occur more frequently, so that **4672** contains the less common epithet type. Cf. *τρίμορφος* (e.g. in Chariclides fr. I, PGM XXXVI 190), *τρικάρανε* (PGM IV 1402, 2525, 2546, 2725, 2747f., 2796f., 2821), *τριπρόσωπος* (Artemid. *Onir.* 2.37, PGM IV 2119, 2880), *τρικέφαλος* (*Sch.* Lycophr. 1176), *τρισκοκέφαλος* (Orph. *Arg.* 975–7), *τριοδίτις* (Chariclides fr. I, PGM IV 2727). For the artistic representation of Hecate *triformis* see *LLMC* VI.1 998–1006, 1009–18. In the descriptions of Hecate *τριπρόσωπος* in PGM IV 2119ff. and 2280ff. only one face (her left, in each case) is that of a dog, whereas in the present text all four faces are the same.

10–11 *τετρ[α]υλάκτ[α]*. This is a new word. Υ is no more than a faint smudge of ink, and *τετρ[ε]*[. . .] would better fill the space, but with clear *λακτ-* following and in the dog context begun at *τετρακύων* the new compound

looks compelling. Simple *ἄλακτης* is not in LSJ⁹ or Suppl. but is recorded from Greg. Naz. by Sophocles *Lexicon* and Lampe, transl. 'barker'; a quadruple version, here in the vocative, would be singularly appropriate, linked to *τετρακύνων* (itself a new word) in the preferred sense ('with four dog-faces') proposed above in 9–10 n.

11 The line may well have run *ἀγρυπνεῖτ[ω] η Δ τ[ης Δ]*, i.e. *ἀγρυπνεῖτω ἡ δεῖνα τῆς δεῖνος*, but this cannot be confirmed from the scanty traces.

14–15 For the restoration, see above 8–9 n. and cf. e.g. PGM XII 396 *ἀγρυπνεῖτω ἡ δεῖνα δι' ὅλης νυκτός τε καὶ ἡμέρας*.

D. COLOMO

4673. EROTIC MAGICAL SPELL

84/68(a)

12.8 × 27.3 cm

Late fourth/early fifth century
Plate XI

Two fragments from a sheet containing a drawing and at least 33 lines. The writing runs along the fibres, in a now light-brown ink; the back is blank. The text is an invocation of a deity to seduce a woman; the spell is clearly erotic, cf. lines 27–28. In addition to the drawing, the papyrus has *characteres* and *voces magicae*, including a long palindrome (15–17). The spell is to be classified as an *ἀγωγή*, reflecting the coercive intentions of the commissioner, i.e. literally dragging the desired person out of her home (C. Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge, Mass. 1999), esp. 25–8, 41–95; D. F. Moke, *Eroticism in the Greek Magical Papyri* (diss. Ann Arbor 1975) 27f.). The presence of personal names and the horizontal folding-marks indicate that the papyrus was written as an individual spell for the purpose of activation rather than as a formulary, i.e. part of a hand-book.

The magical figure seems to represent Seth, depicted here as an ass-headed human figure, equipped with a whip (an item that was commonly used to represent an angry deity) and a spear or, less probably, a torch. In view of the mythical tradition around Seth, Isis, and Osiris, the role of this deity in coercive erotic magical spells is self evident. Seth's mythology is a mirror reflection of the desires and objectives of the common commissioner of love spells: the destruction of an existing relationship, even by harming the beloved party, and bringing about a sexual union to the immediate benefit of the commissioner (PGM LXXVIII 1–14). Furthermore the ass characteristics attributed to Seth, especially the boundless sexuality, may add to our understanding of the role of this deity in erotic spells.

There are no lectional signs. Orthography is poor, with lack of distinction between long and short vowels, e.g. between *ω* and *ο* and between *ε* and *η*; *cau* occurs twice for *ce*. The rough uneven semi-cursive script is carelessly executed, with substantial running of ink. A comparable hand is P. Köln III 151 (*GBEP* 14a) deed of loan, dated to 423.

ωτορ⊗κ>|ελιθν
 γω ÷ε
 οηο ιω
 ουυ αα
 5 αε ιι
 οε οο
 υα (drawing) υυ
 υυ αα
 οο ιι
 10 εω εε
 θθ αα
 ηη υυ
 αα αα
 ιι

15 ιαεωβαφρενεμουνοθηλαν
 ρικριφιαευ[εαιφικριναλ]ηθο
 ννομενερφα[βω]εαι
 έξορκίζω και [...].υοο.[.].υοο
 ν.[...] .τωνις..[.] ...[c.5]
 20 ..[.]ς και τη ..[.] .ηεε .[....]
 [.....]ηγανισον[c.10]
 [.....]α.τον .[c.10]
 [... η]ν έτεκ[ε]ν Εϊσι[δώρα? c.5]
 []..[]

25[.]..[.] .[
 αυτην τω Έλένω ον έτεκεν
 Ταπιαμ έστ' αν χίλησιν χίλη[α]
 συνάψουσιν και το λευκον τω
 μέλανι οτι έξορκίζω και κατ[ά]
 30 τής κρατεας Άνά<γ>κης μας{ς}κε[λλι]
 μαςκελλωφνουκενταβα[ωθ]
 ορεοβα{ς}ζαγρ<α>ρηξιχθωνιπ
 ποχθωνυπ . . τ. υγααν . . .

18 l. $\epsilon\epsilon$ 23 l. Ἰσιδώρα 27 l. χεῖλεω χεῖλεα 28 l. συνάψωσι? 29 l. $\epsilon\epsilon$
 30 l. κραταιᾶς

‘(*vores magicae*) (18ff.) I adjure you . . . (23) (whom) Isidora(?) bore . . . (26) her to Helenus, whom Tapiam bore, until they join together lips to lips and white to black, since I adjure you by mighty Necessity. (*vores magicae*)’

1 Trace above λ , in blacker ink, unexplained, but probably not from an otherwise lost line.

1–14 Magical signs, vowel combinations, and drawing. On *characteres* and magical drawings in general, see W. M. Brashear, ANRW II 18.5, 3440–3, on vowels e.g. D. G. Martinez, *A Greek Love Charm from Egypt* (P. Mich. 757) (ASP 30: 1991) 110 (note that the sequences of **4673** 5–8 (left + right) $\alpha\epsilon\upsilon$, $\alpha\epsilon\omicron\omicron$, $\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$, $\upsilon\alpha\alpha$ correspond exactly to P. Mich. 757 (= Suppl. Mag. I 48) G+H 3–6; see Martinez, op. cit. 111).

Unlike the magical figures in PGM XII 449–52, XXXVI 1–34 and 69–101 (see H. D. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*² (Chicago 1992) 169, 269, 271; also PGM vol. ii, Taf. II Abb. 11, Taf. III Abb. 14 and 18), here the scribe does not mark the figure’s name on the drawing, nor can the name of the deity invoked be deduced from the text. Therefore we must consider the iconography of the figure. The general impression is of an ass-headed figure with perhaps a naked torso, while the lower half of the figure seems to parallel the distinctive depiction in papyri of mummified figures (PGM XII 474–9).

A human, ass-headed figure coincides with the representation of the Egyptian god Seth (H. te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion* (Leiden 1967) 8–12, and J. G. Gager (ed.), *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (Oxford 1992) 69, 72). The most striking parallels are PGM XII 449–52 (mentioned above: in this drawing, Seth is clearly identified as an ass-headed figure, holding spears in both hands); and the erotic spell P. Duk. inv. 230, ed. D. R. Jordan, *GRBS* 40 (1999) 159ff.: drawing of Seth holding in his right hand a whip(?) and in his left a staff(?).

The objects held in a figure’s hands play an important role in identification. Here, in its right hand, the figure is clearly holding a whip. The item held in the figure’s left hand is more stylized, but is most probably a spear. In accordance with Seth’s mythology, both whip and spear indicate the perception of Seth as a powerful and menacing deity (A. Delatte, *BCH* 38 (1914) 191–200; see also the depiction of Seth on tablets in P. Gauckler and R. du Coudray (edd.), *Catalogue du Musée Alaoui* (Paris 1897) 127–8, nos. 31–3). Similar depictions of a menacing deity holding a whip or other weapons are attested in PGM III 65, VIII 64–110, XXIX 1–21, XXXVI 1–34 (Seth), 69–101 (Seth), 102–3, 231–55 (Osiris?) and PDM XII 62–75 (Seth). Cf. also Suppl. Mag. II 69, and for other drawings of Seth, cf. P. Moraux, ‘Une défixion judiciaire au Musée d’Istanbul’, *Mém. Acad. de Belgique, Cl. des Lettres* 54.2 (Brussels 1960) 19–21. An alternative interpretation could be that the figure is holding a torch, represented here in a stylized form.

Seth as an ass-headed figure adds clear sexual connotations. The characteristics of the ass are primarily negative, such as stubbornness and stupidity. An equally typical asinine characteristic is a legendary sexual appetite and ability; for a survey of the ass-mythology see K. Closse, *Anthropozoologica* 27 (1998) 27–39.

15–17 Symmetrical magical palindrome. This is a rather common palindrome, on which see Suppl. Mag. II 65.1–30 comm.

18–30 The scribe follows a standard formula of invocation, which is used in a variety of contexts and which may include the following parts: address to the deity, the actual request or set of requests (usually in the imperative form), the name of the desired person, and the name of the desiring one, usually the commissioner; both are identified by their mothers’ name: I adjure A (= name of deity, sometimes followed by magical names and formulas): bring/bind B (= name of the object of desire), whom C (= the mother’s name) bore, to D (= name of commissioner) whom E (= mother’s name) bore (e.g. PGM XVI 1–75, XXXVI 134–60).

24–5 These lines are on two separate fragments. It seems unlikely that they can form a single line.

26 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu$. The use here of a personal pronoun rather than the name may be an indication that the text missing above may have contained another appeal to the deity.

26–7 Identifying people by matriarchal descent is standard practice in magical texts; see D. R. Jordan, *Philologus* 120 (1976) 127–32. The name Tapiam is also attested in *P. Neph.* 1 and P. Duk. inv. 230.21 (Tapiam), 24 (Tepiam).

ἔστ' ἄν. Cf. B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb* 268; another example in PGM IV 72. Rather than the usual subjunctive, here ἔστ' ἄν is apparently followed by a future indicative (*συνάψουεν*), though this may be an error of *ου* for *ω*. For the third person cf. Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* 23 n. 102.

27–9 χίληεν χίλη[α] (l. χείλεεν χείλεα) *συνάψουεν καὶ τὸ λευκὸν τῷ μέλανι*. The classification of the spell as erotic is based on these lines. Cf. PGM IV 400–4 ἴνα μοι ἄξις τὴν δεῖνα καὶ κεφαλὴν κεφαλῇ κολλήσῃ καὶ χεῖλεα χεῖλεσι *συνάψῃ καὶ γαστέρα γαστρὶ κολλήσῃ καὶ μηρὸν μηρῷ πελάσῃ καὶ τὸ μέλαν τῷ μέλανι συναρμόσῃ καὶ τὰ ἀφροδισιακὰ ἑαυτῆς ἐκτελέσῃ*, P. Duk. inv. 230.25–8 καὶ κολλήσῃ αὐτῆς τὰ χίλη εἰς τὰ χίλη μου, τὴν τρίχαν εἰς τὴν τρίχαν μου, τὴν γαστέραν εἰς τὴν γαστέραν μου, τὸ μελάνιον εἰς τὸ μελάνιον μου; also PGM XVII a.22–3 *μηρὸν μηρῷ καὶ κοιλίαν κοιλίᾳ κολλῶσα καὶ τὸ μέλαν αὐτῆς τῷ ἐμῷ μέλανι*, XXXVI 83, 113f., 150. See also Suppl. Mag. I 38.12 n., and F. Maltomini, *Aegyptus* 59 (1979) 275.

As in PGM IV 403 and XVII a.23 (cf. also Suppl. Mag. II 71 fr.5.2 and possibly 73 ii 8), τῷ μέλανι (τὸ μελάνιον in P. Duk. inv. 230) is to be taken as referring to pubic hair; see also J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*² (New York and Oxford 1991) 143, §163a. We should exclude any notion that τὸ λευκὸν refers to Helenus' semen; if we take τὸ λευκὸν τῷ μέλανι in strict symmetry with χίληεν χίλη[α], τὸ λευκὸν should be analogous with τὸ μέλαν in the passages quoted above: 'white' should then be taken as referring to white pubic hair, probably denoting Helenus' old age: an adjustment of the formula of the handbooks to the real case. Cf. Anacr. *PMG* 358.7 on one interpretation, and *PMG* 420.

29 *ὅτι ἐξορκίζω* denotes a second invocation of the deity. A double, or multiple, invocation is a common phenomenon, and was carried out as a forceful device to ensure the binding of the deity and the victim's defeat (e.g. Suppl. Mag. I 45, 50). As here, the second attested invocation is often marked by an additional binding-device, such as adjuring the deity by means of an intermediate demon, here Ἄνάγκη (Necessity). In accordance with the forceful nature of Ἄνάγκη, this deity is employed frequently in spells of ἀγωγή-type (e.g. Suppl. Mag. I 45.1, 33; PGM XV 13, LXI 27).

30 For κραταιὰ Ἄνάγκη, cf. PGM XXXVI 342, Suppl. Mag. I 45.1, 33.

31–3 The μασκελλι μασκελλω formula appears here in an abbreviated version, the scribe apparently stopping after *ισποχθων*, although he may have completed the line with some modified elements of the full version *πυριχθωνπυριτηγανυξλεπτεανλεπτεαν-μαντονοβοσηλ*. Here, unlike other attested versions of the formula, a sigma has been added in *μασκελλω* (Gignac i 159) and *οροβασζαγρα* (Gignac i 123). For parallels and discussion of this *logos* see Zs. Ritoók, *AAAH* 26 (1978) 433–56; D. R. Jordan, *ZPE* 100 (1994) 328–9.

H. AMIRAV

4674. EROTIC MAGICAL SPELL

23 3B.3/K(1–2)a

14 × 27.5 cm

Late fourth/fifth century
Plate XII

A sheet bearing an erotic charm (*ἀγώγιμον*), with four vertical folds and less clear signs of horizontal folds. The text runs across the fibres in a fair-sized, bold, irregular hand of documentary type, which may be assigned to the late fourth or to the fifth century. The back is blank. The full width is preserved. The upper margin is 1 cm; the lower edge is broken irregularly. There is a vertical strip where the surface is poor, roughly one third of the way along the lines, and the scribe has sometimes avoided writing in this area, thus leaving blank spaces within words.

Below 18, after the end of the *logos*, a horizontal line runs right across the papyrus. Below there are *characteres*, letters, and two drawings (see notes).

Whether **4674** is a formulary or rather an applied charm is not immediately clear,

inasmuch as the text contains elements at first sight contradictory. The title (1) and the anonymous ‘NN’ (13, 16, 17) are typical of formularies. On the other hand, the fact that the *νεκυδαίμονες* asked to help towards the success of the spell are invoked by name (9) could suggest an applied charm. This is the case in every known parallel (see 9 n.); on the only occasion in a formulary that the dead person is envisaged as being invoked by name, we find *ὁ δεῖνα* (PGM IV 2180), the name to be supplied. We might then think of an applied charm containing parts (title and ‘NN’) mistakenly copied from the handbook which served as a model. Similar examples are known (see Suppl. Mag. II p. 352, s.v. Formularies, and *ΖΡΕ* 66 (1986) 159f.; possibly P. Köln VIII 338.18f.; see also R. Kotansky, J. Naveh, S. Shaked, *Le Muséon* 105 (1992) 21 (n. on l. 32); D. Jordan, *ΖΡΕ* 136 (2001) 184f. and 137 (2001) 34); in none of them, however, is the intrusion so extensive. Alternatively, we could imagine a formulary prescribing the invocation of specific *νεκυδαίμονες*, perhaps locally famous *ἄωροι* or *βιοθάνατοι* considered especially potent, in spite of the absence of parallels for this. The names (two of them; there was no room for the third) in 9 have been added in a space left blank, perhaps by a second hand; for a fuller discussion of this, see 9 n. The folds do not necessarily entail the practical use of the *ἀγώγιμον*. In any case **4674** appears to be a self-standing sheet, not (as is usual with formularies) part of a roll.

Poor orthography. No lectional signs except for a diaeresis in 9 *ταῖων*, and a diagonal stroke after *πνου* in 12 as a word divider. ♠ stands for *δεῖνα* (13 (bis), 16, 17 (bis)).

ἀγώγιμον, ἔνπυρον ἐπὶ ὄστράκου θαλασσίου.
 ἐπικαλούμέν σα τὸν μέγαν δαίμονα, ὁ
 μέ[[ν]]γας τύροννος ἐν τῇ γῆ κεί τῶ οὐρα-
 νῶ, πρικταὶ βασιλεῦ· ὄφελον ἠδυνάμην
 5 σου εἰπὶν τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὄνομα· ανοχ ηου
 σεβανα σαπρα[.]αλ φθαμοθ ψ[.]ψ αμου-
 ν θααβαωθ ρθωθ . . . εφραμους.
 ταβαωθ μαρεθριθινη Αρβαθιαωθ.
 ἐπικαλούμε (m.2?) Τάησις Ἐνιλλα Ἐταῖων’ (m.1) ὑμάς,
 10 εἶνα μοι συνπαρασταθῆται καὶ [[πε]]δότε
 αὐτῇ φωτα. ἐπικαλούμε ὑμάς [[τα.]]
 Πνου’κενταβαωθ πορευθῆναι
 πρὸς τὴν δ(εῖνα) υς τὴν δ(εῖνα) αι ἔκσπασον
 αὐτὴν ἐκ{κ} τῆς οἰκ(ί)ας αὐτῆς κε-
 15 ομένη τὰ ἐν[τερα] τὰ κηλάνχηα [τ]ὸν
 .ηλον ὅπως [. . .] .αρακα . . . α[. . .] δ(εῖνα)
 ἐμέ, τὸν δ(εῖνα), ὃν ἔτρεκεν ἡ δ(εῖνα), ἥδη [[ταχὺ]]
 ταχὺ β’.

	c	δ	d	α	d	α
20	h	μ	r		r	
	a	η	a		a	θ
	r	β	w		w	
	a	ζ	i		i	
	c		n		n	
	t		g		g	
	e					
	r					
	e					
	s					

1 l. ἀγώγιμον ἔμπυρον 2 l. ἐπικαλοῦμαι εε 3 l. τύραννος, καὶ 4 l. φρικτὲ 5 l. εἰπέῦν
 ονομα: ο corrected from α 1. ὄνομα 9 l. ἐπικαλοῦμαι ταίων– (filler stroke) 10 l. ἴνα, συμπαραστα-
 θήτε, δώτε 11 l. φοιτᾶν (?), ἐπικαλοῦμαι 12 πνουκενταβαωθ 1. πορευθῆναι 13 (bis), 16,
 17 (bis) Δ 14–15 l. καιομένην 15 l. σπλάγχνα

‘Charm to draw (the beloved), burnt-offering by means of a seashell. I invoke you, the great daimon, the great ruler on the earth and in the heaven, frightful king. Would that I could pronounce your true name: *anoch êou sebana sapra, al phthamoth ps. ps amoun thaabaôh sthôth. . . ephramous. tabaôth marethrihiuê Arbathiaôth*. I invoke you, (2nd hand?) Taesis, Anilla, Taion, (1st hand) so that you stand by me and give me to have sex (?) with her. I invoke you *Pnou Kentabaôth* to go to NN, daughter of NN, and (?) drag her out of her house inflamed in her guts, her inward parts, her . . . , so that she, NN, may . . . me, NN, whom NN bore, now, [[quickly]], quickly (twice).’

1 ἀγώγιμον (l. ἀγώγιμον; omission of γ and ι > η, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 74 and 237–9). ἀγώγιμον (PGM III 279, IV 2231, VII 295, 300a, 973, 981 (?), prob. Suppl. Mag. II 82 fr. A 4; also Gal. *Simpl. fac.* 10.1 [XII 251.11 K.]; Plut. *Non posse suav. vivi* 1093D, [VI.2, 141.2 Westman]) and synonymous, more frequent, ἀγωγὴ are technical terms for the erotic charm that draws the beloved to the lover. For this sort of charm, see C. A. Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge, Mass. 1999), 25–6, 56–65, 84–9. See also **4672** and **4673**.

ἔμπυρον. The technical term indicates a special spell using a burnt-offering (see S. Eitrem, P. Oslo I 1.295 n.). In magical papyri it is always associated with love charms (PGM VII 295 ἔμπυρον ἦτοι ἀγώγιμον, XXXVI 69 ἀγωγὴ, ἔμπυρον βέλτικτον, οὐ μίζον οὐδέν, 102 ἄλλο ἔμπυρον, 295 ἀγωγὴ, ἔμπυρον ἐπὶ θείου ἀπύρου; note the similarity of this last title with **4674** 1).

ἐπὶ ὀστράκου θαλασσίον. ἐπὶ here means ‘based on’, ‘by means of’, ‘with’ as in PGM IV 1496 ἀγωγὴ ἐπὶ ζιμύρης ἐπιθυομένης, 1390f. ἀγωγὴ ἐπὶ ἠρώων ἢ μονομάχων ἢ βιαίων, 1928f. ἀγωγὴ . . . ἐπὶ παντὸς ἐκύφου, XXXVI 295 (see prec. n.), 333 ἀγωγὴ ἐπὶ [ζ]ιμύρης, Suppl. Mag. II 72 i 5 ἐπὶ μήλο[υ] ἐπωδῆ, etc.; not ‘(to be written) on’ (although this is here the function of the seashell).

ὀστράκου θαλασσίον. The seashell is prescribed as a writing material in PGM IV 2218 (a restrainer of wrath), VII 300a (love charm), 374 (ἀγρυπνητικόν), 467 (love charm), Audollent, *DT* 234.6f., 32(νικητικόν). See F. De Salvia, ‘L’*ὀστρακον θαλάσσιον* nei papiri magici grecoegiziani’, *PapLuf* 1 (1992) 293–307.

2 ἐπικαλοῦμεν (l. -μαι). αι > ε + superfluous -ν, rather than first person plural of the active (cf. also 9, 11). The same writing probably in P. Köln VIII 340.33f.

ca (l. ce). For ε > a, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 283ff.

τὸν μέγαν δαίμονα. Cf. PGM V 250, also XII 171f.; *μεγαδαίμων* in IV 3.

2–3 ὁ μέγας τύροννος. Arthrous nominative (for vocative) after accusative, as frequently: cf. e.g. PGM IV 1217ff. ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε τὸν ἐν τῷ χρυσῷ πετάλω . . . ὁ μέγας θεός, ὁ φανείς ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, V 459ff., XII 367ff., XVI 16ff., LXXXVII 5ff.

3 μῆ[ν]γας. The ν was washed out. For insertion of medial nasal before a stop, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 118.

τύροννος (l. τύραννος). For α > ο, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 286f. τύραννος in magical papyri: PGM III 339, 474f. (see A. Jacoby, *ARW* 28 (1930) 274 n. 5), IV 2602 (= 2664), V 471, VI 33, XIII 605; P. Carlsberg 52.16 (W. M. Brashear, *Magica Varia*, Pap. Brux. 25 (Brussels 1991) 39).

κεί (l. καί). For αι > ει, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 260.

4 φρικταί (l. φρικτέ). φ > π (see Gignac, *Grammar* i 86ff.) also in 12 Πνου. φρικτός, φρίσσω and cognates are frequent in PGM (see vol. iii (Index) 197). Vocative φρικτέ in *Orph. hymn.* 65.4 (of Ares).

4–5 ὄφελον ἡδυνάμην σου εἰπὶν (l. -εἶν) τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὄνομα (l. -μα). Usually the operator states that he knows the true name of the god and this knowledge gives power to his requests ('do this because (ὄτι) I know your name'). Moreover, ὄφελον + impf. is normally used for an unattainable wish in the present. Such lack of self-confidence is atypical in magic. The collocation ὄφελον ἡδυνάμην also in Ach. Tat. 5.15.5 and *Vit. Aesop.* (Vita G) 107 (p. 68 Perry).

5 ὄνομα (l. -μα). For α > ε, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 278ff. For ἀληθινὸν ὄνομα, cf. PGM IV 278, V 115, VIII 41, 43, XIII 621f., XXXIIa 24f. The 'true name' is the sequence of magical words and names which follows. On name in magic, see e.g. LXV 4468 recto i 7–8 n.

ανοχ. The Coptic personal pronoun, 'I' or 'I (am)'; see Suppl. Mag. I 42.30 n.

6 σεβανα. Cf. PGM IV 2782 σεβαρα, IX 3 σεβαν.

[.]αλ. Possibly [B]αλ, Baal (on which see Suppl. Mag. I 39.9 n.).

φθαμοθ. Cf. PGM I 162 φθη μωθ. Possibly in φθα one should recognize the Egyptian god Ptah; see PGM, vol. iii (Index) 232 and W. M. Brashear, *ANRW* II 18.5, 3600.

6–7 αμμον. π not impossible. The god Amun? See also following note.

7 θαβαωθ. Or rather 6–7 αμμον (Coptic αμου 'come!', see Suppl. Mag. I 43.2 n.) Πθα (the god Ptah; for the reading, see prec. n.) αβαωθ? αβαωθ is well known; see PGM vol. iii (Index) 236.

8 ταβαωθ. Cf. PGM V 61f., XII 80. Also part of the magical name Φνουκενταβαωθ, which occurs in 12.

μαρε-. Cf. PGM IV 1549 ναιεμαρε, 366 μαρεχθανα, XII 336 μαρειθ; *Pistis Sophia* 244.10 Schmidt μαρει.

Αρβαθιαωθ. Variation of the common Αρβαθιαω ('fourfold Iao', a reference to the Tetragrammaton), on which see W. Fauth, 'Arbath Jao', *OC* 67 (1983) 65–103. The form with added -θ also in PGM V 55.

9 ἐπικαλοῦμαι (l. -μαι). Here constructed with ἵνα + subj., in 11–12 with infinitive; cf. respectively PGM XIII 378f. and IV 3230–3. ἐπικαλοῦμαι is normally addressed to gods or daemons, the usual verb for νεκυδαίμονες (see next note) being ὀρκίζω and cognates.

Τάγεις "Ανιλλα Ταίων". In all likelihood the names of the νεκυδαίμονες addressed. Whereas usually the soul of the dead is adjured anonymously, sometimes it is addressed by its name: see Suppl. Mag. I 37 intr.; add B. Bravo in *Poikilia: Études offertes à J.-P. Vernant* (Paris 1987) 200 and D. R. Jordan, *GRBS* 40 (1999) 167 (n. on l. 19). At least "Ανιλλα (Τάγεις and Ταίων are less certain) seems to be the work of a second hand (although ink and pen appear the same). Thus, the original scribe left a blank space (erroneously before ἵμας and not after it), which was filled in later. The situation seems different from that where scribes copying spells from a manual leave a blank space (instead of δεῖνα) to be filled in later at the point of sale with the names of the persons involved in the magic procedure (for examples, see 4672 3 n.). It is very unlikely that the choice of the νεκυδαίμονες would be left to the suggestion of the client. The reason for the blank space will have been something quite different and unforeseen, for example the need to confirm the identity of the deceased. That νεκυδαίμονες are implied in this charm seems confirmed by the drawings below the text, which represent mummies. They are two in number, possibly Τάγεις and "Ανιλλα. The name of Ταίων was added above the line, perhaps later but in any case because there was no space; either way, no third drawing was executed.

Τάγεις. For the accentuation of this name see W. Clarysse, *ZPE* 119 (1997) 180.

"Ανιλλα also in VI 903 32, P. Giss. Univ. III 26.23, P. Mich. IX 546.11; Ταίων in XXXVI 2785 5, PSI III 162.20, P. Cair. Isid. 6.90, SB XVIII 13858.22, written Ταείων in P. Lond. V 1731.45 and P. Münch. I 11.77.

10 *συνπαρασταθῆται* (l. *συνπαρασταθῆτε*). For *συνπαρίσταμαι* “stand beside so as to assist” (LSJ *s.v.*, II) said of the god or daemon, cf. PGM IV 345–7 ὀρκίζω πάντας δαίμονας τοὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ συνπαρασταθῆναι τῷ δαίμονι τούτῳ (with the parallels Suppl. Mag. I 46.6, 47.6, 48 J.6, 49.15f., 50.10f.) and the British Museum gem discussed in C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets* 180; cf. also Men. fr. 500.1 K.–A., Orig. Princ. 3.1.19 (536.4 G.–K.), and see L. Robert, *Hellenica* 6 (1948) 110. More frequent is *παρίσταμαι*: cf. e.g. PGM II 79, IV 2034, 2501f., XII 95, etc. In general, see K. Keyßner, *Gottsvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus* (Stuttgart 1932) 103.

10–11 δότε (l. δώτε) αὐτῇ φωτα. Difficult. If φωτα, is it from (a) φῶς or (b) φῶς? In neither case is the sense obvious. Moreover, in (a) the plural is disturbing; (b) ‘give her a man’ or rather ‘give (me) to her as (her) man’ is not clear, although the usually poetic φῶς would perhaps not be problematic in itself, occurring in P. Ryl. II 77.34 (192) and P. Erl. 75.15 (535–7). No parallel helps. Or, (c) is φωτα a miswriting for ποτά (with reference to the thirst of the spirit of the dead to be quenched; see Suppl. Mag. I 45.12–13 n.)? (d) R. W. Daniel suggests reading αὐτῆ(ν) φοιτᾶ(ν) ‘and give her (to me) to have sex with’ (for φοιτᾶν of sexual intercourse, cf. LSJ *s.v.* I 3). On these lines, perhaps better is αὐτῇ φοιτᾶ(ν) ‘and give me to have sex with her’ (for φοιτᾶν with dative, cf. Hdt. III 69). *οι > ω* is rare (see Gignac, *Grammar* i 294), but it would not particularly surprise in this text.

11 [τα.]. Perhaps the scribe started writing *Τάσις*, cf. 9, making the insertion at the wrong point; or perhaps this was an aborted attempt to insert *Ταῖων*, which he then added above the line in 9. The extended sigma of *ύμας* as filler-stroke shows that this word was intended to be the last in the line.

12 *Πνούκενταβαωθ*. The usual spelling of *Πνου* begins with Φ-. It is a component of the *Μασκελλι*-logos (cf. PGM vol. iii (Index) 241 and see W. M. Brashear, *ANRW* II 18.5, 3601). There is an oblique stroke between *πνου* and *κενταβαωθ*, certainly used as separator; cf. PGM XII 290, where the name is written in two parts: ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὸν Μασκελλι . . . τὸν Φνου, τὸν Κενταβαωθ κτλ. Therefore *ύμας* in 11 can refer to the daemons *Πνου* and *Κενταβαωθ*. Otherwise, if *ύμας* is to be referred to the three *νεκυδαίμονες* as in 9, one has to suppose a construction of ἐπικαλοῦμαι with the double accusative (‘I call upon x by x’), as in PGM LXIV 3–6 ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὰ ἄγια δνόματα.

πορευθῆναι (l. *πορευθῆναι*). Probably a mistake from miscopying rather than phonetic (*ευ > ε* and insertion of nasal; Gignac, *Grammar* i 228f. and 118f.).

13 *υς*. Misspelling for *ῆς*? Possibly the scribe intended to write something like PGM IV 350 (. . .) δείνα ῆς ἔχει τὴν οὐσίαν, but then he changed to the formula τὴν (= ῆν) δείνα (cf. *ibid.*), without cancelling what he wrote previously. If so, {*υς*}. Or, as F. Vendruscolo suggests, misspelling for *εἰς*, i.e. *εἰς τὴν δ(είνα)* as an erroneous duplication of the preceding *πρὸς τὴν δ(είνα)*? See also below 13 n. on *αι*.

τὴν. Article for relative? See Gignac, *Grammar* ii 179. Cf. especially PGM LXI 10 πρὸς τὴν δείνα, τὴν ἔτεκεν ἢ δείνα; XXXVI 249f. καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ δείνα, τὸ(ν)? ἔτεκεν ἢ δείνα; Suppl. Mag. I 41.10–12 ἄξον Τερμούτῳ, τὴν ἔτεκεν Σοφία, Ζοήλ, τῷ ἔτεκεν Δροσερ. Or for *τῆς*?

αι. Simply {*κ*}*αι*? Or *αἰ*, miswriting for *αἰ* (see Gignac, *Grammar* i 196)? Or for *ῆ*? (for *η > αι*, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 247f.), with imperative, a rare but attested usage. If so, we would have here a sequence similar to PGM LXI 10f. ἀπολύω ἐπὶ πρὸς τὴν δείνα, τὴν ἔτεκεν ἢ δείνα. ἢ διακόνησόν μοι κτλ.; see A. D. Nock, *PBA* 17 (1931) 262.

Both of the difficult sequences (*υς* and *αι*) occur immediately after *δ(είνα)*; perhaps they were connected with this word. One might try to read *υς* as *ν* (a possible reading) in order to get *δ(είνα)ν* (for which there is apparently no parallel, but cf. *Φνα* in Suppl. Mag. II 79.8); but this does not help with *αι*.

ἔκσπασον. Singular after *ύμας*. Similar vacillation in number is frequent; see Suppl. Mag. I 44.10 n.

13–14 *ἔκσπασον αὐτὴν ἐκ{κ} τῆς οἰκ(ί)ας αὐτῆς*. For similar violence in a similar context, cf. PGM IV 2490f. καὶ ἐκδιώξασα αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς τόπου καὶ πάσης οἰκίας κτλ.; Suppl. Mag. I 42.13f., 34, 44, etc. *καταναγγάσατε Γοργονίαν . . . βληθῆναι Σοφία*, 16f., 38 *δαμάσατε αὐτὴν ἐκπηδήσαι ἐκ παντὸς τόπου καὶ πάσης οἰκίας*; 45.46f.

14 *ἐκ{κ}*. See Gignac, *Grammar* i 161.

οἰκ(ί)ας. For omission of accented *ι* before the gen. sing. *-ας* ending in nouns of the first declension, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 303.

14–15 *κειομένην* (l. *καιομένην*) τὰ ἐν[τερα] κτλ. Cf. PGM VII 471ff. *ἄγε μοι τὴν δείνα . . . καιομένην τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν καρδίαν*; Suppl. Mag. I 48K 35ff. *πυρομένην, καομένην, τηκομένην τὴν ψυχὴν, τὸ πνεῦμα, τὴν γυνεκίαν φύσω*; P. Duk. inv. 230.22ff. (ed. *GRBS* 40 (1999) 159ff.).

τὰ ἔν[τερα]. The supplement satisfies space and sense, although ‘the guts’ do not appear elsewhere in erotic magical papyri as an object of torment.

σηλάνχηα (l. επλ-). Probably a mistake from copying. For the inward parts in erotic magic, cf. PGM IV 1529f., 1543f., VII 990f.; also IV 376f., VII 389, 650.

16 ηλον. The initial traces are difficult, and thus the identification of this word. If we ignore the traces in the left margin, to be linked with more such ink in the next line, all as yet unexplained, then (aligned with line beginnings above and below) there is, first, a stroke (in two parts?) rising to right in upper part of line. To the right of this, there is apparently a descending then rising ligature to η, with possibly a rising stroke joining this ligature on the left. These traces might combine to yield λ, cf. in ἐμέ just below, although this is far from easy. If so, then μηλόν (l. μηρόν)? Or τ[ό]ν μῆλον ‘cheek’? They are unattractive. Perhaps μηλόν for μυελόν (cf. PGM IV 1529ff. καῦσον αὐτῆς τὰ ἐπλάγχνα, τὸ κτήθος, τὸ ἦπαρ, τὸ πνεῦμα, τὰ ὀστά, τοὺς μυελούς)?

[. . .] .αρακα. . . α[. . .]. First, end of curve from left touching alpha at mid-height. After alpha, possibly λ with a short right leg; then a small circle followed by an upright (οι?); then probably τ (foot of the vertical and right part of the horizontal). A form of παρακαλέω seems probable, παρακαλοῖτα[ι for παρακαλήται (for η > οι, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 266)? Perhaps παρακαλοῖτα[ι ἦ]. If so, εἰς or πρὸς would be required before ἐμέ, but it is not easy to see where the preposition could fit in. However, parallels in magical papyri for ‘so that she is incited towards me’ are lacking. The lacuna after ὄπως certainly has space for more than the lost portion of supposed π, but here as in other lines the scribe may have avoided writing over the damaged vertical strip, cf. introd.

17 Unexplained ink in margin before first letter. ἔτεκεν: the reading presupposes that the scribe left a gap between τ and ε, cf. introd.

17–18 ἦδη || ταχὺ | ταχὺ β. In 17 the vertical which in the plate appears above the horizontal of the tau of ταχὺ belongs with certainty to delta in 16, i.e. Δ. That the scribe had cancelled ταχὺ in 17 appears certain (an oblique stroke across α and χυ washed out). It is odd that he added the β in 18 above the line. Single ἦδη with repeated ταχὺ is not expected; cf. however P. Duk. inv. 230.30 with n. (ed. *GRBS* 40 (1999) 159ff.). Another β could have been inserted above ἦδη; a faint stroke could be from its horizontal base, cf. 18 and 22.

Below 18, a horizontal line has been drawn right across the sheet. Below this and close to the left edge is a column of about eight *characters*. There could have been more below, but the papyrus breaks off. To the right of these *characters* the letters δ μ η β ζ stand one above the other in another column. Further to the right, but centrally under the block of script above, are two drawings; in the space to the right of each are some isolated single Greek letters.

These drawings represent two mummies, in profile, facing right, wrapped in a close network of bandages that cover them from shoulders to feet. External wrappings arranged in a criss-cross pattern correspond to real use during the Roman period (see S. Ikram, A. Dodson, *The Mummy in Ancient Egypt* (London 1998) 164f.) and is regularly seen in representations of mummies in papyri (PGM XII col. xvii, photo in PGM vol. ii, Taf. II Abb. 12 and *OMRO* 56 (1975) pl. XIII) as well as in lead-tablets (e.g. *Suppl. Mag* I 37A; R. Wünsch, *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom* (Leipzig 1898) 12, 16, 20, etc.) and gems (e.g. C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets* (Ann Arbor 1950) D 8, 11, 13, 151, 350; H. Philipp, *Mira et magica* (Mainz am Rhein 1986) nos. 107–10, 112, 205, etc.). The two faces, as often, appear free from bandages. The head of the left-hand figure has nose, mouth, and eye; that of the right-hand one is little more than a circle with the suggestion of a nose, and with an eye in the center. On the chest of the left-hand mummy, the regularity of the network of bandages is interrupted, and in a larger space are signs of uncertain meaning. They might conceivably be interpreted as two cursive Greek letters (βκ?), but perhaps more likely represent stylized amulets or better still the hands of the mummy crossed over its chest.

On the head of each figure are two oblique projections. That three of these projections touch the horizontal line above them appears to be accidental, since one does not. A parallel is probably the British Museum gem D 151 in Bonner, op. cit., p. 278 (see also p. 108f., and D. Wortmann, ‘Kosmogonie und Nilflut’, *BjB* 166 (1966) 106–8), which shows a mummy with three projections on its head like pins with small rings at the top. This decoration might be interpreted as a schematic representation of the two or three lotus buds appearing on the head of the Nile god (Bonner, p. 109; for this detail in the iconography of the Nile, see D. Bonneau, *La crue du Nil* (Paris 1964)

328; M.-O. Jentel, *LMC* VI.1 (1992), *s.v.* Neilos, 726); its use for a mummy is explained by the identification of the dead person with Osiris, who in turn is identified with the Nile and with moisture in general.

The two mummies might then represent two of the *νεκυδαίμονες* called upon by the operator (see above 9 n.). If so, a close parallel is the lead-tablet Suppl. Mag. I 37 A, where similarly the dead man is addressed by his name and the drawing of his mummy is carved on the tablet.

M. Betrò notes a resemblance between the faces of the mummies, especially that on the left, and the hieroglyphic representing a bovine head (A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*² (Oxford 1950), Sign-list F 1), and would prefer to see them as sacred animal mummies. If so, then the oblique projections referred to would naturally be interpreted as horns or ears. In that case, the possible mention of Ptah in 6–7 above might offer a link between text and drawings: the Apis bull was considered as the *ba* of the Memphite god Ptah.

F. MALTOMINI

IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

The documents published in this section have been chosen for their chronological and prosopographical interest. The majority come from the fifth century, a period that has yielded very few papyri in comparison with other centuries. Many of these texts provide the earliest or latest known dates for the use in Egypt of certain consulates for dating purposes. Others attest Oxyrhynchite magnates with titles of nobility, and offer glimpses into the provincial aristocracy of the Later Roman Empire. The last two items in this section expand the meagre amount of evidence on Oxyrhynchus under Persian rule.

Abbreviations used:

CLRE = R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (1987).

CSBE = R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (1978).

PLRE = J. R. Martindale, *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* ii (1984).

4675. ORDER TO PAY

86/21(b)

7.5 × 7.8 cm

397/8?

Euethius, who issued this order to pay, of which only the left part survives, may be an eminent Oxyrhynchite who flourished at the end of the fourth and/or the beginning of the fifth century; if so, this is the first dated text to attest him.

The writing is across the fibres. Back blank.

Εὐῆθιο[ς
παράχ[ου
κίας . . [.
(ἔτους) ο . [

4 L

‘Euethius . . . Pay . . . Year 7- . . .’

¹ *Εὐῆθιο[ς*. Presumably identical with *Εὐῆθιος πολ(ιτενόμενος)* in P. Heid. IV 314.2, also attested as boat-owner and *exactor*; cf. P. Heid. IV 313.18 [π]λ(οῖον) *Εὐῆθίου ἐξάκτορος*.

³⁻⁴ Restore *διακο[κίας, τριακο[κίας*, etc., probably referring to myriads of denarii.

⁴ The trace after ο would suit *λ*, i.e. read (*ἔτους*) οδ [μγ; *λ* and *ζ* are less likely possibilities. Year 74/43 = 397/8; see *CSBE* 79.

N. GONIS

4676. ORDER TO SUPPLY

83/12(a)

10.5 × 5.5 cm

6 September 404

The left part of an order to supply an unknown commodity, possibly issued by an important Oxyrhynchite active around 400, see 1 n. A further point of interest is the attestation of Oxyrhynchite era year 81/50 = 404/5, not recorded previously.

The writing is across the fibres. The back is blank.

Πτολεμῖνος [
 παράσχου Οὐρσικίνῳ καὶ [
 (ἔτους) πα ν// Θῶθ θ. [

3 L

‘Ptoleminus . . . Deliver to Ursicinus and . . . Year 81/50, Thoth 9.’

¹ Πτολεμῖνος. Possibly the same as the Ptoleminus who occurs in two other documents of similar type and date: SB XXII 15627 (398), in which he authorises the payment of 25 solidi to an *optio* for οἰνόκρεον; and PSI IX 1074 (400), an order to pay 4⁵/₆ solidi to an ἐπιμελητῆς ἀννωνῶν προσηκτόρων as an *adaeratio* for large quantities of οἰνόκρεον and hay. Ptoleminus was evidently a man of some standing. It is tempting to identify him with the man known to have been an *exactor* and a shipowner at around that date; see P. Wash. Univ. II 83 introd. and 5 n., LXIII 4383 4 n. If he is the same as the *vir clarissimus* whose heirs feature in the ship-list 4685 back 2, he was promoted to the clarissimate in the early years of the fifth century.

² Οὐρσικίνῳ. This is the first occurrence of the name in a papyrus; SEG XXXII 1590.1 is the only other Egyptian text attesting it. On the name see I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (1965) 330.

³ For the conversion of the date see *CSBE* 79, 96.

N. GONIS

4677. LEASE OF LAND

96/71(b)

6 × 9 cm

26 September 408
Plate XVI

The upper right part of a land lease of annual duration, addressed to an *ex-praepositus* and landowner in the Oxyrhynchite. It records the earliest Egyptian dating by the consulate of Anicius Auchenius Bassus and Fl. Philippus coss. 408.

On Oxyrhynchite land leases of this period see most recently *Tyche* 15 (2000) 93–6, and R. Mazza, *L'archivio degli Apioni* (2001) 106–20, 189–91 (list); cf. also 4682 and 4687.

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

[ὑπατείας Φ]λ(αουίῳ) Βάσσου καὶ Φιλίππου
 [τῶν λαμ(προτάτων), Θ]ῶθ κθ.
 [Φλ(αουίῳ) c. 8?] . . ἀπὸ πραιποσίτων

[γεουχ(οὔντι) ἐν τῇ λαμ] (πρᾶ) καὶ λαμ(προτάτη) Ὁξυρρυχιτῶ(ν) πόλει
 5 [παρὰ Αὐρ(ηλίου) -άμ] μωνος Πιερωῦτος
 [ἀπὸ ἐποικίου Π]εκτη τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ
 [χ(αίρειν). ἐκουσίως ἐπι]δέχομαι μισθώσασ-
 [θαι πρὸς μόνο]ν τὸ ἐνεστὸς ἔτος
 [πε νδ σποράς] τῆς ὀγδόης ἰνδ(ικτίωνος)
 10 [ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρ]χόντων σοι ἐν
 [c.10] κ. . . ε. ἐδάφου[

 1 φλ]χ 4 λαμς 9 νδς

‘In the consulship of Flavii Bassus and Philippus, *viri clarissimi*, Thoth 29.

‘To Flavius . . . , *ex praepositis*, landowner in the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, from Aurelius — ammon son of Peêous, from the hamlet of Pecty of the same nome, greetings. Voluntarily I undertake to hold on lease for the current year 85/54 only, for the sowing of the eighth indiction, from your possessions at . . . field . . .’

1–2 For the consuls of 408 see *CLRE* 350–1; cf. 352–3. The only other Egyptian reference is SB I 1540 of 19.iii.409, an inscription from Alexandria. For the conversion of the date see *CSBE* 79, 96. So far as I can see, no other papyrus dated to 408 has been published.

2 Θ]ώθ. Φαμεν]ώθ would be too long for the space.

3] . . . The second letter is probably η; κ, i.e. Ἰ]κάκ (cf. below), seems less likely. The name could have been a short one if the *gentilicium* was written out in full, Φλαουίω.

3–4 Cf. SB IV 7445.3–4 (382) Φλ[α]ουίω Κρησπείνω ἀπὸ πραιποσίτων | γε[ο]υχοῦντι ἐπ[ι] τῆς λαμ(πρᾶς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης) Ὁξυρρυχιτῶν πόλε(ως); XVI 1973 3–5 (420) Φλαουίω Ἰσὰκ ἀπὸ πραιποσίτων γε[ο]υχοῦντι ἐν τῇ λαμπρᾷ καὶ λαμπροτάτῃ Ὁξυρρυχιτῶν | πόλει ἐπιτρόπῳ τῆς θειωτάτης οἰκίας; also PSI I 90.3 (364). On military landowners at that time see R. S. Bagnall, *Chiron* 22 (1992) 47–54, and *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (1993) 177–9; also J. Banaji, *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity* (2001) 115–16.

4 Ὁξυρρυχιτῶ(ν). Ὁξυρρυχιτῶν was surely meant, but ν seems to have been a victim of the quickness of the writing.

6 ἐποικίου Π]εκτη. On this settlement see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell’Ossirinchie* (1981) 141–2. LX 4074 7 (307) offers an early instance, and is the basis for restoring ἐποικίου here.

9 Year 85/54 = 408/9; see *CSBE* 79. The σπορά is a reference to the crops, reckoned, i.e. taxed, on the basis of the *praedelegatio*, set on 1 May in the next Julian year: this was the start of (fiscal) indiction 8. On the issue see R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 289–90. Cf. also 4682 8–9, 4687 7.

11 At the start of the break one would expect to find πεδίοις, followed by a reference to the village where the land is located, cf. 4687 9–10 n.; but Πεκτην cannot be read in the traces: could it be a place-name near Πεκτην? ἐν | [τῷ αὐτῷ ἐποι]κίῳ would fit space and trace, but the collocation is not paralleled in this context; even if this were what the papyrus had, I do not see what came immediately before ἐδάφου[ς (not ἐπί; ἐν would be possible palaeographically, but stumbles on the grammar).

N. GONIS

4678. TOP OF DOCUMENT

49 5B.99/A(2-3)b

15.3 × 4.9 cm

18 October 409

This scrap offers the earliest Egyptian record of the consulship of Honorius Aug. VIII and Theodosius III coss. 409. The nature of the original document cannot be determined, though there is little doubt that it was a legal agreement.

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

[ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμ]ῶν Ὀνωρίου τὸ η καὶ Θεοδοσίου τὸ γ' τῶν αἰωνίων
 [] Αὐγούστων, Φαῶφι κα.
 [. . . c.22] . . . ίου πολιτευόμενος τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμ[π]ροτάτης
 [Ὁξυρρυχιτῶν πόλεως τοῖς κ]ληρονόμοις Διονυζί[ου] γενομένου πρεσβ[υτ]έρ[ου] . . .

'In the consulship of our masters Honorius for the 8th time and Theodosius for the 3rd time, the eternal Augusti, Phaophi 21.

. . . son of —ius, *curialis* of the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, to the heirs of Dionysius, former priest . . .'

¹ For the consuls of 409, see *CLRE* 352-3; cf. 354-5. A consular rather than a postconsular clause has been restored by reason of space; cf. l. 4. It is unclear whether in SPP XX 115.1 the sequence Θεο]δοσίου τὸ γ τῶν represents the remnants of a consular or a postconsular clause.

³⁻⁴ πολιτευόμενος τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμ[π]ροτάτης | [Ὁξυρρυχιτῶν πόλεως. For the formulation cf. P. Mil. II 64.2 (440, cf. 4688 2 n.), LXVIII 4687 3-4 (441), 4688 4-5 (442?), XXXIV 2718 3-4 (458). We cannot tell whether this πολιτευόμενος was a Flavius or an Aurelius, though the former possibility is the likelier.

N. GONIS

4679. FOOT OF DOCUMENT WITH CONSULAR DATE

95/82(a)

15 × 10 cm

21 December 418

The consular date clause is all that survives of a document whose nature cannot be ascertained, though it is conceivable that it was a petition (contracts most often have the date clause at the top, petitions at the foot). It furnishes the earliest attestation of Honorius Aug. XII and Theodosius Aug. VIII coss. 418, previously known only from post-consular clauses of 419.

On the back, close to the left-hand edge, two sets of vertical lines at 1.7 cm from each other, perhaps the remains of a quadrangular frame (a drawing?).

ὑπατίας τῶν [δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν] Ὀνωρίο[v]

τὸ ἰβ, καὶ Θεοδοσίω[υ] τῶ η τ[ῶν] αἰωνίων
 Ἀγούτστων, Χοιάκ κε.

1 1. ὑπατείας

‘In the consulship of our masters Honorius for the 12th time and Theodosius for the 8th time, the eternal Augusti, Choiak 25.’

1–3 Cf. **4681** 1–2. On the consulship, see *CLRE* 370–1; cf. 372–3. For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 80, 97.

N. GONIS

4680. ORDER TO SUPPLY OIL

63 6B.66/E(1–2)a

29 × 5 cm

11 February 419

An order for the delivery of one *sextarius* of oil to a female servant or slave. Tatianus, who issued the order, may be same as a senior Oxyrhynchite *curialis* attested in the late fourth and early fifth century; see further 1 n.

The back is blank.

Τατιανός Νέπωτι ἐλαιουργῶ χ(αίρειν).
 παράσχου Κυριακῆ πεδίσκη ἐλαί(ου) ξέστην ἔν, (γίνεται) ἐλ(αίου) ξ(έστης) α.
 (ἔτους) ρε ξδ, Μεχεῖρ ιζ. (m.2) καισεμίωμα ἐλέου ξέστας μίαν ομ().

1 χς 2 ελαις, / ελ'ξ 1. παιδίσκη, ἔνα 3 L, ομ'; 1. καισεμίωμα ἐλαίου ξέστην ἔνα μόνον

‘Tatianus to Nepos, oil-worker, greetings. Deliver to Cyriace, servant girl, one *sextarius* of oil, total 1 *sextarius* of oil. Year 95/64, Mecheir 17. (2nd hand) ‘I have countersigned one *sextarius* of oil only.’

1 *Τατιανός*. There seem to have been two *curiales* of this name active at Oxyrhynchus in the late fourth and early fifth century, cf. K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 115 (1997) 218–9. A Claudius Tatianus, *riparius*, and hence of curial stock, occurs in VII **1033** 3 (392); he is presumably identical with the *curialis* and ship owner in P. Heid. IV 313.17, a document of c.402. He may have appeared again in SB XVI 12523 of 394, with Macrobius, another eminent Oxyrhynchite, on whom see LXVI **4529** 3 n. (I take the view that in SB 12523.1 the sequence *Μακρόβιος Τατιανός* represents two different persons, not one.) The *Τατιανός πολ(ιτευόμενος)* of P. Heid. IV 314.2.7 (V) is possibly this same *curialis*. A different person is the *curialis* and *riparius* Fl. Tatianus of P. Gron. Amst. 1 = SB XXIV 15970.2 (455). The case of P. IFAO II 12a.2 (V) *γεούχω Τατιαν[ῶ]* is less clear; the provenance of the papyrus is unknown, but it is conceivable that it refers to one of these two Tatiani.

2 *πεδίσκη* (1. *παιδίσκη*). On the term see **4683** 2 n. Very few *παιδίσκαι* occur in papyri of late date. We hear of them twice in connection with the Apions: PSI VIII 957.5 (VI), attesting a payment of wine *ταῖς γεουχ(ικαῖς) παιδίσκαις*, and PSI VI 709.6, 27 (566). Cf. also BGU III 725.10, 29 (618).

On disbursements of oil to *παῖδες* or *παιδάρια*, see F. Morelli, *Olivo e retribuzioni nell'Egitto tardo* (1996) 240 index s.v.

ξέστην ἔν (l. ἔνα). The same mistake in SB XVI 12665.2 (IV/V).

3 For the conversion of the date see *CSBE* 80, 98.

ξέστας μίαν ομ(), l. ξέστην ἔνα μόνον. ξέστας could be a slip because Tatianus was used to countersigning for larger amounts. It is less easy to guess why he got the gender wrong, but it is noticeable that the clerk also got it wrong, ἔν for ἔνα. At the end, *μιανομί* might represent μίαν (ν)όμ(ην) for μίαν μόν(ην).

N. GONIS

4681. LEASE OF AN UPPER ROOM

75/15(c)

15.5 × 15.3 cm

10(?) August 419

The upper part of a lease of an upper room at Oxyrhynchus, rented to a woman. The duration of the lease is not specified, but was probably determinable at the pleasure of the lessor. The papyrus breaks off at the point where the amount of rent was to be indicated. For the latest update on Byzantine leases of house property, see *ZPE* 132 (2000) 191–2 and *ZPE* 141 (2002) 169; see also *JJP* 32 (2002) 35–41, and below **4686**, **4689**, **4692**, **4693**, and **4694**.

The text is of considerable chronological interest: besides offering the latest Egyptian record of the postconsulate of Honorius Aug. XII and Theodosius Aug. VIII coss. 418, it attests an indictional date that is not in harmony with the current view on the start of the Oxyrhynchite indiction; see 9–11 n.

The docket is written in a shaky and crude hand, not to be identified with that responsible for the main text.

μετὰ τὴν [ύ]π[ατεί]αν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Ὀνωρίου τὸ ἰβ
 καὶ Θξ[ο]δοσί[ο]υ τὸ η τ[ώ]ν αἰωνί[ων Α]ὐγουύστων,
 Μεσορῆ ἰξ.
 Αὐρηλίω Δω[ρ]οθέω Cωσιβείου ἀπὸ τῆς λαμπρᾶς
 5 καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλεως
 παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Θασιίας Ἀτρήτος ἀπὸ κώμης Τα-
 κόνα τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ, καταγιγνομένη(ς)
 ἐνταῦθα τῇ Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλει. ἐκουσίως
 ἐπειδέχομαι μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος μηνὸς
 10 Μεσορῆ τ[οῦ] ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους ρε ξδ τῆς τρίτης
 ἰνδικτίονος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων σοι ἀπὸ οἰ-
 [κ]ίας οὔς[η]ς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει ἐπ' ἀμφόδου
 [Τ]ευμεροῦθεως ὑπε[ρ]ῶν τόπ[ο]ν ἔνα
 [σὺν χρ]ηστη[ρίοις πάσι· κα]ὶ τελ[έ]σῃ π[ε]ρ ἐ[νοικί]ου

Back, downwards, along the fibres:

15 (m.2) † μίσιθωσις Θαη[σί]ας . . . [

4 l. *Κωσιβίου* 9 l. *ἐπιδέχομαι* 11 *ἰνδικτιονος*

‘After the consulship of our masters Honorius for the 12th time and Theodosius for the 8th time, the eternal Augusti, Mesore 17 (?).’

‘To Aurelius Dorotheus son of Sosibius, from the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, from Aurelia Thaesia daughter of Hatres, from the village of Tacona of the same nome, resident here in the city of the Oxyrhynchites. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from the present month of Mesore of the current year 95/64 of the third indiction, from the property belonging to you, out of a house situated in the same city, in the quarter of Teumenuthis, one upper room with all (its) appurtenances; and I shall pay for rent . . .’

Back: ‘Lease of Thaesia . . .’

1–2 On the consulate see **4679** 1–3 n. For the conversion of the date see *CSBE* 80, 101.

6–7 *Τακόνα*. A village in the northern part of the Oxyrhynchite nome; see **LX 4087** 2 n. (para. 2) and the references cited there.

7 *τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ*. This refers back to Ὁξυρρυχιτῶν πόλεως, and may be explained by the fact that the old nome had become a *civitas*; cf. also **4682** 6 (with note) and **4687** 5; cf. also P. Kell. I 20.3–5 n. A similar interchange of the terms *πόλις* and *νομός* is in evidence in P. Benaki 2.2–5 (IV) ἀπὸ κώμης Καινῆς ἐγ// πάγου τοῦ Ἡρακλεοπολίτου νομ[οῦ] . . . ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως.

καταγινομένη(ς). On this participle, which had a ‘special currency in third- and fourth-century Oxyrhynchus’, see J. G. Keenan, *GRBS* 42 (2001) 59 n. 7. This is its latest instance. (There is no need to restore *οἰκῶν* [καὶ *καταγινομένος* in SB XVI 13015.13, of 632.)

9–11 ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος μηνὸς | Μεσορῆ τ[οῦ] ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους ρε ξδ τῆς τρίτης | ἰνδικτίονος. Oxyrhynchite era year 95/64 ran from 418 to 419, and indiction 3 from 419 to 420; see *CSBE* 80. The current view is that the indiction used in Oxyrhynchus for dating purposes started on Thoth 1, the first day of the civil as well as of the local era year; see *CSBE* 26–7. **4681** tells us that indiction 3 was underway in Mesore, that is, before Thoth 1. In view of the new evidence, it is worth examining the issue of the Oxyrhynchite indiction afresh.

The earliest possible instance of the use of the Thoth indiction at Oxyrhynchus is furnished by VII **1041**: dated to 9 June (Pauni 15) 381 by the consuls, the text refers to a loan to be repaid on the ‘first day of the month of Mesore [= 25 July] of the present 14th = the 6th = the 2nd year [= 380/1] and the current ninth indiction [= 380/1]’; unless the indiction figure is wrong, it seems that the indiction started in Thoth. But a contemporary text, the lease SB IV 7445, tells a different story: dated to 12 July (Epeiph 18) 382, the lease is set to start ‘in the next month of Mesore of the current year 15/7/3 [= 381/2] of the 11th indiction’; if that indiction were reckoned from 29 August (Thoth 1) 382, the reference would have been to the tenth, not the eleventh indiction. This is an exact parallel to **4681**. **4688**, even if not entirely free from ambiguity, would lend further support to the notion that the indiction started earlier than Thoth: an indiction supposed to start on Thoth 1 seems to be underway some day in Pachon or Pauni; see **4688** introd. Compare also the lease XLV **3203**, dated June–July (Epeiph) 400, said to start ἀπὸ νεομηνία[ς] | τοῦ ἑξῆς μηνὸς Μεσορῆ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος | ἔτους ος με ἀρχῆ τῆ[ς] τεσσαρεσκαιδεκ[άτης] | ἰνδικ[τ]ίονος (ll. 9–12; year 76/45 = 399/400, indiction 14 = 400/1), and the loan XVI **1973** (420), to be repaid ἐν τῷ | Παῦνι μηνὶ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους ρς ξε εἰς ἀρχὴν | τῆς τετάρτης | ἰνδ[κ]τι[σ]νός (ll. 13–15; year 96/65 = 419/20, indiction 4 = 420/1; note that εἰς ἀρχὴν = ἀρχῆ): in both texts the ‘start’ of the indiction is placed earlier than Thoth.

Two documents of later date may also attest the use of an indiction starting earlier than Thoth 1. The first is XVI **1958**, a lease dated Mesore 26, indiction 15, set to start on Thoth 1 'of the coming year 153/122 of the auspicious fifteenth indiction'; the date has been converted to 19 August 476. Bagnall and Worp 'think that indiction 15 [= 476/7] in the heading is a slip, cf. its equation in the same text to era year 153/122 [= 476/7]' (*CSBE* 27 n. 21); 'the scribe has changed the number too soon or omitted ἀρχῆ' (*CSBE* 51 n. 2). But there is no need to assume an error if the indiction was reckoned from a date before Thoth 1. Further, there is no 'equation' of the indiction to the era year: what the text says is that the first day of Thoth of year 153/122 falls in the fifteenth indiction (νεομηνίας τοῦ ἐξῆς μηνός Θῶθ | τοῦ εἰσιόντος ἔτους ρηγ ρκβ τῆς εὐτυχούς | [πε]ντεκαίδεκ[άτη]ς ἰνδικτίωνος, ll. 8–10). The other text is P. Lond. V 1797 = P. Bingen 129, a lease dated Epeiph 16 (?), indiction 10 (= 10 (?) July 501), said to begin on Thoth 1, indiction 10. (Not much can be made of the lease P. Yale I 71, since it dates from the last day of the civil year, and its dating clause contains an error: it is dated 28 August 456 (epagomenal 5), and the lease is set to start on Thoth 1 'of the current year 133/101 (sic) of the present tenth indiction'. This indiction 10 (and year 133/102) ran from 456 to 457. There is a problem with the era year referred to as 'current', since year 133/102 was to start on the very next day, cf. *CSBE* 26 n. 11. If 133 is a mistake for 132, the dating of this papyrus may be brought in line with those discussed above.)

But a text from the middle of the century attests an indiction that must have begun in Thoth, or in any case later than Pachon. P. Harr. I 149 is dated Year 120/89, indiction 12, Pachon 26 (= 21 May 444, cf. BL VII 67). Year 120/89 = 443/4, indiction 12 = 443/4; this twelfth indiction cannot have been reckoned from 1 May 443, more than a year earlier than the date of the text as indicated by the era year. The use of a Thoth indiction is attested again in LIX **3985** of 9 May 473, and from then on, with the possible exception of XVI **1958** and P. Bingen 129, the Thoth indiction is the only one in evidence (note that it can be verified only in texts dating from May to August); cf. LIX **3985** (473), SB XX 15134 (483), VIII **1130** (484), P. Mich. XIV 682 (496), P. Köln V 235 (496), etc.

It thus seems that in the later fourth and earlier fifth centuries the start of the Oxyrhynchite chronological indiction oscillated between the *praedelegatio* of 1 May (Pachon) and the start of the traditional civil year of 29/30 August (Thoth). But sometime in the course of the fifth century the Thoth indiction prevailed, and the use of the Pachon indiction was restricted to fiscal matters. I wonder whether at the start Oxyrhynchus used for dating purposes the Pachon indiction only; this indiction, besides indicating the fiscal year, was also used as the chronological one in most regions of Egypt. But given the importance of the local era year, which coincided with the civil year, and for the sake of simplicity, the indiction was equated with the era year. Attempts at simplifying the dating systems are known from later times; see LVIII pp. 54, 57, and P. Thomas pp. 260–2.

A reference to the Pachon indiction may be detected in a formulation present in the dating clauses of several Oxyrhynchite documents: ἰνδικτίωνος x , ἀρχῆ of $x + 1$. It was once thought that the second part of the formula refers to an indiction that began with the *delegatio*, see *CSBE* 26, but LIX **3985**, of 9 May 473, the earliest document to use the formula, has shown that the *praedelegatio*, the 'Pachon indiction', was meant; see **3985** 1 n. para. 3. This may also be surmised from X **1280** 8–10 (assigned to the last quarter of the fourth century in *CSBE* 21 and 61 n. 10) ἀπὸ τοῦ παρελθόντος μηνός Παχῶν ἀρχῆ τῆς δωδεκάτης | ἰνδ(ικτίωνος); cf. also XVI **1973** 14–15 (420), cited above. It may be worth asking whether the appearance of the formula was due to the establishment of the Thoth indiction: the scribes indicated what was a relative novelty in the dating clauses by referring to the old- as well as the new-style indiction.

Something similar may be observed in the case of the Heracleopolite chronological indiction. Bagnall and Worp, *BASP* 16 (1979) 239–43, have argued that it ran from Thoth to Mesore, just as the Oxyrhynchite one. The earliest instance of the Thoth indiction at Heracleopolis is in P. Rain. Cent. 123 of 478; but the earlier evidence, scanty though it may be, seems to suggest that Heracleopolis used for dating purposes an indiction that started earlier than Thoth.

First, we have SPP XX 90, a loan of money dated 15 June 415 (cf. BL VII 261), to be repaid μηνὶ Ἐπειφ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους | τεσσαρεσκαίδε[κ]άτης ἰνδικτίωνος (ll. 11–12). (The expression looks back to such passages as P. Rain. Cent. 86.13–14 (381) ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος μῶνός Φαμ[ε]ρῶθ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτους | ἔτους ἰνδικτίωνος, or BGU III 938.6 (384/5) [τοῦ ἐνεστῶ]τος ἔτους / καὶ ζ' / καὶ β' / ἰδ ἰνδικ(τίωνος).) This indiction 14 ran from 415 to 416; if it began on 30 August 415 (Thoth 1), the loan would have to be repaid more than one year later, in the summer of

416 (Epeiph = 26 June – 24 July); but the repayment is stated to take place within ‘the current year’ (cf. VII **1041**, discussed above). This means that the indiction must have started earlier than Thoth 1.

The same is implied by P. Benaki 2, a lease of a room assigned to the later fourth century (the consular date has not survived; it probably dated from Mesore or the epagomenal days), set to be of annual duration, starting ἀπὸ νεομηναίας τοῦ εἰσιόντος | μηνὸς Θῶθ τῆς παρούσης ιγ// | ἰνδικτίονος (ll. 15–17): on the face of it, the indiction in which Thoth fell had started before Thoth 1. In view of SPP XX 90, there is no need to assume that the scribe advanced the number of the indiction too early.

A comment on the relation between Heracleopolis and Oxyrhynchus in this period may be in order. In associating the Oxyrhynchite with the Heracleopolite indiction, Bagnall and Worp, *BASP* 16 (1979) 242, invoke R. Rémondon, *Pap. Congr. XI* (1965) 138, who argued that in the later fifth century and for a great part of the sixth ‘Héracléopolis et la moitié méridionale au moins de son territoire paraissent être dans la dépendance politique et sous l’emprise économique d’Oxyrhynchos.’ Even if the texts on which Rémondon’s thesis rests are not quite relevant (SB VI 9152 = XVIII 13953 and SPP XX 129 simply attest the Heracleopolite estate of Fl. Apion I, while ‘P. Oxy. 1938’ [*sic*, for XVI **1983**] only says that Fl. Strategius, the son of Apion I, was a *πρωτεύων* at Heracleopolis and Oxyrhynchus), the close link between the two cities is hardly in doubt; cf. now P. Mich. XVIII 794, assigned to the later fifth century, in which the municipal authorities of Oxyrhynchus are required to supply wreaths for the public market of Heracleopolis. Perhaps this was due to the fact that the *praeses* of Arcadia had a residence at Heracleopolis (cf. LX **3986** introd. para. 2), while Oxyrhynchus was the capital of the province.

12–13 ἀμφόδου [T]ευμερούθεως. For a list of attestations of this quarter see S. Daris, *ZPE* 132 (2000) 220–1; for earlier literature see P. Bingen 105,7 n. See also LXV **4478** 7–8 n.

13 ὑπε[ρ]ῶν τόση[ο]ν. On the term see G. Husson, *OIKIA: Le vocabulaire de la maison privée en Égypte d’après les papyrus grecs* (1983) 284–5. The only other reference to an upper room in a lease is in the Oxyrhynchite SB IV 7444 (327; cf. *ZPE* 132 (2000) 183–4).

N. GONIS

4682. LEASE OF LAND (?)

105/214(a)

15.3 × 12 cm

9(?) October 421

The upper part of a lease, probably of land and of indefinite duration. It offers the latest mention in the papyri of the postconsulate of Theodosius IX and Fl. Constantius III *cos.* 420, and attests two eminent Oxyrhynchites, Valerius, *vir clarissimus*, and his son Flavius Daniel, on whom see 4–5 n.

The back is blank.

μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν τοῦ δεσπότην ἡμῶν Θεοδο[κίου τοῦ]
αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου τὸ θ καὶ Φλ(αοῦτου) Κωνσταντίου
τοῦ λαμπροτάτου τὸ γ, Φάωφι ιβ.
Φλαουῖω Δανιὴλ υἱῶ τοῦ τῆς λαμπρᾶς μηνῆμος
5 Οὐαλερίου παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ἰωάνου Ὠρ[ί]ωνος
ἀπὸ κόμης Cενύρεως τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ.
ἐ[κουσ]ίως ἐπιδέχομαι μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ
[ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους ρη ξζ σπορᾶς τ]ῆ[ς] εὐτυχοῦς

[ἐκτης ἰνδικτίονος ε.15] . .

1 ἰ. ὑπατεῖαν 2 φλ 3 λαμπροτάτου: το corr. from τα 4 φλαουῖω 5 ἰωανου; ἰ. Ἰωάννου

After the consulship of our master Theodosius the eternal Augustus for the 9th time and Flavius Constantius, *vir clarissimus*, for the 3rd time, Phaophi 12 (?).

‘To Flavius Daniel, son of Valerius of splendid memory, from Aurelius Ioannes son of Horion from the village of Senyris of the same nome. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from the present year 98/67, for the sowing of the auspicious sixth indiction . . .’

1–3 For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 80, 96. This is the latest attestation of the consulship of Theodosius IX and Constantius III coss. 420, on which see *CLRE* 374–5; cf. 377. (The earliest Egyptian record of the consuls of 421 is SB XVIII 13882 of 20 December 421.) Constantius was proclaimed Augustus in the West on 8 February 421, but was not recognized in the East. He died on 2 September 421, about a month earlier than the date of **4682**.

Constantius was a *patricius*, which is recorded in the earliest mention of his third consulate in a papyrus, VIII **1134** 2 of 3 March 421: τοῦ λαμπροτάτου πατρικίου. It is unclear whether any other papyrus refers to his patriciate, although this has been restored in P. Select. 8.2 (22 April 421) τοῦ [λαμπροτάτου] πατρ(ικίου) and SPP XX 114.2 (25 July 421) τοῦ λαμπροτάτου πατρ(ικίου) (cf. BL VII 262). P. Select. 13.19 (25 June 421) only has τοῦ λαμπροτάτου.

4–5 Φλαουῖω Δανιήλ νίῳ τοῦ τῆς λαμπρᾶς μηνῆς Οὐαλερίου. Also attested in the undated CPR V 24.3, 7 Δανιήλ Οὐαλερίου, and **4685** back 8 πλ(οῖον) Δα[v]ι[ή]λ Οὐαλερίου λαμπροτάτου; cf. also **4683** 1. It is unclear whether λαμπροτάτου in **4685** refers to the father or the son.

Valerius, Daniel’s father, may occur in VII **1048** 10 πλοῖον Οὐαλερίου πολ(ιτενομένου); possibly he is also to be recognized in LXII **4346** 2 (380) πλοῖον Οὐαλερίου E[. He is likely to recur in P. Wash. Univ. II 83.7, in the company of several other Oxyrhynchite grandees.

6 *Κενύρεως*. A village in the Upper Toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome; see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell’Ossirinchi* (1981) 170; LXIII **4356** 4 (III) and P. Hamb. III 228.17 (VI) offer additional attestations.

τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ. On the face of it, there should have been an earlier reference to the (capital of the) nome — now *civitas* — as part of the description of Fl. Daniel, i.e. that he comes from or is a landowner or holds a municipal office at Oxyrhynchus, but this has been omitted. Cf. e.g. **4681** 7 or **4687** 5, where τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ refers back to τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρρυχιτῶν πόλεως. For a similar omission, cf. LXIII **4388** 3 n.

8–9 ἀπό τοῦ could have been followed either by ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους (given that the text is written in Phaophi, *εἰσιόντος* is much less likely), which would imply that the text is a lease of land, cf. e.g. P. Mich. XI 611.6 (412), LXVIII **4687** 6 (441), LXIII **4390** 7 (469), LXVII **4615** 9 (505); or by ὄντος/ἔξῃς μηνός name τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους, which would suggest that this is a lease of a building, cf. e.g. LI **3639** 7 (412), LXVIII **4681** 9 (419), **4686** 5 (440), XVI **1957** 7 (430), PSI III 175.8 (462), L **3600** 10 (502). The latter option is too long for the space, unless the papyrus did not introduce the name of the month by a participial construction, cf. **4692** 6–7 (453), but the latter is an isolated case; see the note there. It is thus likely that this is a lease of land.

For the restorations adopted in the text cf. P. Oslo II 35.9–10 (426, cf. BL VII 124) and L **3582** 5 (442). The document was written in the course of Oxyrhynchite era year 98/67 = 421/2; the crops were those of the sixth indiction (422/3). Cf. **4677** 9 n.

4683. ORDER TO SUPPLY WINE

84/50(a)

11.3 × 6.6 cm

1 December 426

The upper left part of an order to deliver wine to servants (*παιδάρια*), issued by Daniel, a name borne by two eminent Oxyrhynchites at that time; see below 1 n. It is mainly of interest for confirming the existence of a variety of wine called ‘Theban’; see further 3 n.

The writing is across the fibres. The back is blank. A scrap (not transcribed) may join the end of l. 2, but this is far from certain.

Δ[α]νιήλ [c.6?] Ἀθανασ[ί]ω
 παράσχου τοῖς παιδαρίοις τοῦ κυρ(ίου) [
 οἴνου Θυβαεικοῦ διπλᾶ δύο, γί(νονται) δι(πλᾶ) β [μό(να).]
 (ἔτους) ργ οβ, Χοιὰκ ε. (m.2) σεσημείωμαι οἴν[ο]υ δι(πλᾶ) δύο μόνα.]

2 κυρ 3 l. Θηβαϊκοῦ γι Δ 4 L 1. σεσημείωμαι

‘Daniel to Athanasius . . . Supply to the servants (?) of lord . . . two double jars of Theban wine, total 2 double jars only. Year 103/72, Choiak 5.’ (2nd hand) ‘I have countersigned two double jars of wine only.’

1 Δ[α]νιήλ. Daniel is perhaps to be identified either with the son of Macrobius, who occurs in **4685** back 7, or with the son of Valerius, attested in **4682** 4, **4685** back 7, and CPR V 24.3, 7. It is unclear whether Δ[α]νιήλ was followed by another word such as a title (e.g. *λαμ’* for *λαμπρότατος*) or a short blank space.

2 *παιδαρίοις*. Cf. **4680** 2, **4699** 2. There is some uncertainty about the exact meaning of the term; here it probably refers to servants or slave-boys. See J. Beaucamp, *Le Statut de la femme à Byzance* ii (1992) 58 n. 38, LXII **4349** 6 [*sic*, for 7] n., and J. Banaji, *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity* (2001) 186 with n. 107.

τοῦ κυρ(ίου) [. For payments in kind to *παιδάρια* in the service of an office holder or other potentate, cf. P. Haun. III 68.2 (402) τοῖς παιδαρ(ίοις) Ἀετίου ναυάρχου, X **1335** 2 (482) τοῖς παιδ(ίοις) τῷ κόμ(ιτι) Διογένη (sic), P. Princ. II 86.2–3 (VI) τοῖς παιδαρ(ίοις) Ἀειώνιος | τρακ(τευτοῦ); also **4699** 2 (504).

3 οἴνου Θυβαεικοῦ (l. Θηβαϊκοῦ). See LIV **3740** 16–17 n., discussing the term *κνι[δί]ου Θηβαϊκοῦ*. This was wine of Theban origin, so that in **3740** 17 (312), **3762** 16 (326?), and **3765** i 4 (327) *κνιδίου* may well have been used for οἴνου; cf. N. Kruit, K. A. Worp, *APF* 46 (2000) 109 n. 109. Kruit and Worp further suggest restoring οἴνου Θηβαϊκοῦ (l. Θηβαϊκοῦ) *κνίδια* in *M.Chr.* 318.16 (295).

διπλᾶ. On this measure, whose capacity ranged from 4.5 to 8 *sextarii*, see K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 131 (2000) 146–8.

4 For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 81, 97.

N. GONIS

4684. PETITION (?) ADDRESSED TO A *RIPARIUS*

83/78(b)

10.8 × 9 cm

431

This scrap, probably of a petition, confirms that the petition P. Köln V 234, also of 431, was addressed to a *riparius*; see 3 n.

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

μετὰ τὴν ὑπ[ατε]ρί[αν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου τὸ γ' καὶ
 Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ τὸ γ' τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀυγούστων, (month day)
 Φλαουτίῳ Ἰωσήφ ῥιπαρί[ω] Ὁξυρρυχίτου
].[] .υ [] .[]

‘After the consulship of our masters Theodosius for the 13th time and Valentinian for the 3rd time, the eternal Augusti . . .

‘To Flavius Ioseph, *riparius* of the Oxyrhynchite . . .’

1–2 On the consulship, see *CLRE* 394–5; cf. 396–7. P. Palau Rib. 14 and P. Rain. Unter. 95,21 provide additional attestations.

3 ῥιπαρί[ω] Ὁξυρρυχίτου is restored after P. Select. 8.3 (421) and other earlier documents, but ῥιπαρί[ω] τῆς Ὁξυρρυχίτων (probably abbreviated), attested in later documents, cf. LXVII 4614 1 n. para. 6, is possible too.

4684 confirms that Fl. Ioseph was addressed in the capacity of *riparius* in P. Köln V 234.3 (1.ix.431), where the editor read *πολιτευομένῳ* [καὶ ῥιπαρίῳ τῆς Ὁξυρρυχίτων]. It is less likely, though not entirely impossible, that he is to be recognized in the much later SB XVIII 13596.3 (464) *Φλ(αουτίῳ) Ἰωσήφ τῷ αἰδεσίμῳ πολιτ(ενομένῳ) καὶ ῥιπαρίῳ τῆς Ὁξυρρυχίτων*. But it is also possible that he is to be identified with the *vir clarissimus* whose ship is mentioned in 4685 back 3; if so, he apparently had not attained the clarissimate by 431.

N. GONIS

4685. LISTS OF SHIPS AND FREIGHTS

103/110(c)

14.5 × 20 cm

First half of fifth century
 Plate XIII

Both sides of the papyrus list ships, with their owners, captains, and freights. It is likely that both sides are by the same hand, even though they are written upside down to each other.

The ships were used for the transportation of the tax grain down the Nile. For this type of document, see P. Heid. IV 313 introd.; cf. also *ZPE* 143 (2003) 163–5. We possess a fair number of similar texts, all of which come from Oxyrhynchus: VII 1048, XXIV 2415, XLII 3079, XLIV 3194 21–5, P. Harr. I 94, P. Heid. IV 313. Cf. also CPR V 24, P. Heid. IV 314, P. Wash. Univ. II 83 (cf. *Tyche* 17 (2002) 81 n. 10), all three lists of payments from Oxyrhynchites known to have owned ships. Several related issues have been discussed by A. B. J. Sirks, *Food for Rome: The Legal Structure of the Transportation and Processing of Supplies for the Imperial Distributions in Rome and Constantinople* (1991); cf. also (for the earlier period) L. De Salvo, *Economia privata e pubblici servizi nell'Impero romano: I corpora naviculariorum* (1992).

Ship-owners were among ‘the major holders of all forms of wealth and power in society’ (R. S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (1993) 36–7). 4685 belongs in the same milieu. Seven Oxyrhynchites were previously attested as *λαμπρότατοι* (*viri clarissimi*) in papyri of

Back, other way up:

-] φ() · πλ(οῖον) Θεωδώρου Λευκαδίου πολι(τευομένου) ὑπὸ Ἰουλι. [
] . /· πλ(οῖον) κληρ(ονόμων) Πτολεμίνου λαμ(προτάτου) ὑπὸ Θέωνα [
] · πλ(οῖον) Ἰωσήφ λαμ(προτάτου) ὑπὸ Θεώδορον Π. . . [
] φ() · πλ(οῖον) κληρ(ονόμων) Ἰερακίωνος ὑπὸ Ἰουκτορα [
 5] πλ(οῖον) Τατιανοῦ πολι(τευομένου) ὑπὸ Ἀ[γ]αθον Ἀγάθου [
] . /· πλ(οῖον) κληρ(ονόμων) Στρατηγίου λαμ(προτάτου) ὑπὸ Θέωνα [
] φ() πλ(οῖον) Δανιήλ Μακροβίου πολι(τευομένου) ὑπὸ Μέλαν[α
] πλ(οῖον) Δ[α]ν[ι]ήλ Οὐαλερίου λαμ(προτάτου) ὑπὸ Εὐλό[γι]ον
 πλ(οῖον) c.9] ὑπὸ Αταν Ἀγουτίου [
 10 πλ(οῖον) c.5 λαμ] (προτάτου) ὑπὸ Φοιβάμμωνα Δ[
 πλ(οῖον) c.9] πολι(τευομένου) ὑπὸ Ἀγαθον [Ἀγάθου (?]
 πλ(οῖον) c.11] ὑπὸ Τιμόθε[ον
 scant traces of three lines

Front

5-6, 8-10 ♂ 6, 9 l. Θεωδώρου 6 l. Δωροθέου 7, 8, 10 πλ' 11 ♂ ✕

Back

1, 4, 7 φ 1-12 πλ' 1 l. Θεωδώρου 1, 5, 7, 11 πολτ 1 ἰουλι. [2, 4, 6 κληρ
 2, 3, 6, 8, 10 λαμξ 3 l. Θεόδωρον 4 ἱερακιωνος, ἰουκτορα 6 θεωνα: θ ex corr.

Front, 5 ff.

' artabas 3,031 . . .
 ' . . . Theodorus under Paulus son of Dorotheus artabas 1,664 Ship . . .
 ' Ship of Am— . . .
 ' . . . and of Ambrosia under Macarius artabas 1,837 Ship of Amm— . . .
 ' . . . artabas 3,577
 ' . . . Theodorus artabas 7,829 Ship of Tatianus . . .
 ' . . . sol. . . . and den. myr. 900
 ' . . . 8,142'

Back

' . . . Ship of Theodorus son of Leucadius, *curialis*, under Iuli— . . .
 ' Ship of the heirs of Ptoleminus, *vir clarissimus*, under Theon . . .
 ' Ship of Ioseph, *vir clarissimus*, under Theodorus son of P— . . .
 ' . . . Ship of the heirs of Hieracion, under Iuctor (= Victor?) . . .
 ' Ship of Tatianus, *curialis*, under Agathus son of Agathus . . .
 ' Ship of the heirs of Strategius, *vir clarissimus*, under Theon . . .
 ' . . . Ship of Daniel son of Macrobius, *curialis*, under Melas . . .

- ‘ Ship of Daniel son of Valerius, *vir clarissimus*, under Eulogius . . .
- ‘ Ship of . . . under Atas son of Anutius . . .
- ‘ Ship of . . ., *vir clarissimus*, under Phoebammon son of (?) D— . . .
- ‘ Ship of . . ., *curialis*, under Agathus son of Agathus (?) . . .’
- ‘ Ship of . . . under Timotheus . . .’

Front

4 L. Cf. 5, 6, 8, 10. The symbol may, as often, represent ἀφ’ ὧν, but the fragmentary context rules out certainty.

5 . . . [. πλ[(οῖον) does not seem to be a possible reading.

6 Θε[ωδόρου, l. Θεοδώρου. Cf. 10. This is the shipowner’s name or patronymic.

7 πλ(οῖον) Ἀμ[. Cf. 8 Ἀμβροσίας and πλ(οῖον) Ἀμμ[.

8 Ἀμβροσίας. The name is not attested otherwise in the papyri. The only Egyptian reference I have found is I. Syringes 1870.5.

πλ(οῖον) Ἀμμ[. Just possibly the same as Ἀμμονιανός in CPR V 24.6, 10. The Ἀμμώνιος πρεσβύτερος, ναυκληροκυβερνήτης, of P. Harr. I 94.7 is too early for our purposes; see *ZPE* 143 (2003) 164–5.

10 Θεωδόρου, l. Θεοδώρου. Is this the patronymic of the shipowner or of the skipper? Cf. 6.

(ἀρτάβαι) Ζωκθ. A capacity of 7,829 artabas (c.235 tonnes, assuming that 1 art. = c.30 kg) far exceeds the known capacities of ships in this period; the second largest is 5,200 art. (CPR XVIIIA 7.2, of 317). There are of course several Ptolemaic κέρκουροι of larger capacity, see I. J. Poll, *APF* 42 (1996) 137–8. Cf. also below 12 n.

12 Ηρμβ. If the reading of the figure (= 8,142) stands, it is likely to refer to artabas and a ship carrying them, cf. above 10 n. The trace visible before the figure, a short medial horizontal, could be part of the artaba symbol.

Back

1, 4, 7 The abbreviation, phi intersected by an oblique stroke, might stand for φ(υλή), a term that probably indicates a geographic division, known exclusively from Hermopolite documents; see A. Papaconstantinou, *Tyche* 9 (1994) 94. For the form of the abbreviation compare SB XXII 15598v.2–14 (cf. *Tyche* 9, Taf. 19), and BGU XVII 2723.1, 24, 49, 74, 114bis, 131, 149, 160 (cf. Taff. LII–LIII, with J. Gascou, *CE* 77 (2002) 333). If this holds, φ(υλή) will have been preceded by a numeral.

1 Θεωδόρου Λευκαδίου πολ(τενομένου). Theodorus son of Leucadius recurs in CPR V 24.2, which can now be shown to be of Oxyrhynchite provenance. Leucadius may well be the same as a known boat-owner, cf. VII **1048** 15 Λευκαδίου πλοῖον (XLII **3079** 5 πλοῖον Λευκαδίου refers to an earlier Leucadius, cf. *ZPE* 143 (2003) 164). The *curialis* Leucadius of XXXIV **2718** 3 (458) might have belonged to the same family.

The addition of the patronymic might serve to distinguish this Theodorus from another eminent Oxyrhynchite of this name, viz. the landowner who appears with the title λαμπρότατος in LV **3803** 2 (411) and P. Oslo II 35.4 (426, cf. BL VII 124), perhaps the same as the ναύαρχος Fl. Theodoros son of Theon in P. Select. 8.4 (421); see LV **3803** 2 n., and *ZPE* 141 (2002) 159–60.

Ἰουλι [. Ἰουλίω or Ἰουλια[νῶ.

2 Checkmark rather than abbreviation stroke? Cf. 6.

Πτολεμίνου λαμ(προτάτου). See **4676** 1 n. Not previously known as a *vir clarissimus*. Ships of Ptoleminus occur in P. Heid. IV 313.12 and P. Oslo III 88.22–3.

λαμ(προτάτου). On the clarissimate in early fifth-century Egypt, see *Tyche* 17 (2002) 86, with references.

ὑπὸ Θέωνα. Possibly the same person as Theon in 6; cf. Agathus in 5 and 11.

3 Ἰωσήφ λαμ(προτάτου). Not previously known as a *vir clarissimus*. His possible identification with a known Oxyrhynchite *curialis*, on whom see **4684** 3 n., is discussed in the introduction.

ὑπὸ Θεόδωρον Π. . . [. One may compare the skipper in VII **1048** 2 ὑπὸ Θεόδωρον Παριτ, written some time after 392. He cannot have occurred in P. Harr. I 94.9 ὑπὸ Θεόδωρον κυβερνήτην, since the text is much earlier than **4685**; see *ZPE* 143 (2003) 164–5.

4 *Τερακίονος*. Presumably the same person as the *πολιτευόμενος* in P. Heid. IV 314 ii 2. The absence of an indication such as *πολι(τευσαμένου)* or *λαμ(προτάτου)* may be an accident.

Ύούκτορα. The name is not attested elsewhere, but probably *Ούύκτορα* was intended; for *Ύου-* representing *Ούύ-*, see P. Turner 32.10 n.

5 *Τατιανοῦ πολι(τενομένου)*. Cf. perhaps front l. 10. On this person, see **4680** 1 n. A *πολιτευόμενος* Tatianus also occurs in CPR V 24.1, 12.

ὑπὸ Ἄ[γ]αθον Ἀγάθου. Cf. 11. Apparently identical with [Ἀρ]ήλιος Ἄγαθος Ἀγάθου κυβερνήτης πλοίου | [τῆ]ς θειοτάτης οἰκίας, attested in LXIII **4388** of 423.

6 *Στρατηγίου λαμ(προτάτου)*. It is tempting to identify this Strategius with the *πολιτευόμενος* in P. Heid. IV 314 ii 6. See further the introduction above.

7 *Δανιήλ Μακροβίου πολι(τενομένου)*. The patronymic may serve to distinguish this Daniel from Daniel son of Valerius, who occurs in the next line. Cf. also **4683** 1. *πολι(τενομένου)* could apply either to the father, in which case we may expand *πολι(τευσαμένου)*, or the son. Macrobius was a *πολιτευόμενος*; cf. P. Wash. Univ. II 83.1. A deceased *πολιτευόμενος* named Daniel occurs in VI **913** 3-4 (443, cf. BL VII 132; BL X 139 suggests reading *πολιτευσ[α]μένου* in place of ed. pr.'s *προπολιτευσ[α]μένου*); but this could also be the son of Valerius.

On Macrobius, see LXVI **4529** 3 n.; ships of his occur in **1048** 11 and 14.

8 *Δα[ν]ι[ή]λ Ὀυάλεριού λαμ(προτάτου)*. On Daniel and his father Valerius, see **4682** 4-5 n.

9 *Αταν*. A rare name, otherwise attested only in O. Leid. 24.4, 17 (III BC; though note that the reading is not entirely certain), P. Mich. III 219.22 (end of IV); cf. BL XI 131, and P. Lond. V 1652.14, 16 (IV). Editors treat it as a perispomenon.

10 The name of the *clarissimus* is lost. To judge from the space, it must have been short. Of known Oxyrhynchite *viri clarissimi* of this date other than those attested in **4685**, namely Limenius, Phoebammon, Samuel, Saturnilus, Theodoros, Theophilus, and Timagenes, only Samuel would fit, and in fact there is a reference to a *πλοῖον Καμουηλίον* in LVI **3862** 22 (IV/V). On Samuel, attested between 417 and 438, see *Tyche* 17 (2002) 85-6.

11 *πλ(οῖον) c.9 π[ολι(τενομένου) ὑπὸ Ἄγαθον [Ἀγάθου (?)]*. The *πολιτευόμενος* whose name is lost may have been Tatianus, if the captain is the same as the one who occurs in 5. But this is not necessary; Agathus may have been a captain of more than one ship, or in the service of more than one shipowner (cf. the skipper Apphus in XLII **3079**), or this may be a second Agathus.

N. GONIS

4686. TOP OF A LEASE

86/38(a)

18.5 × 9.2 cm

5 September 440

This and **4693-4** are the earliest items in the archive of Flavius Eulogius (*PLRE* II 421, Eulogius 10) and his descendants; for a recent overview and bibliography, see T. M. Hickey, J. G. Keenan, *AnPap* 8-9 (1996-97) 209 ff. All three concern Eulogius, whose activity is now shown to span at least thirty-six years; he is first attested in 440 (**4686**), last heard of as alive in 476 (XVI **1958**), while he was dead by 487 (XVI **1961**). His previous earliest attestation was in **1958**.

What was already known is that Eulogius was a native of Oxyrhynchus, where he possessed a number of properties, and a civil servant. His descendants were likewise members of the *militia civilis* and property-owners. (According to E. R. Hardy, *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt* (1931) 39, the archive is unique in illustrating 'the actual rise of a family into the landowning class', but this is not true.) **4686** now casts unexpected light on Eulogius' earlier life: we see him as an owner of property, which he offers for lease, at a time when he

is not in imperial service and is a mere Aurelius. Clearly, civil or imperial service provided plenty of opportunity for enrichment and social mobility, but if Eulogius was a man of certain means before joining the service, his wealth did not entirely originate in it. This may serve as a warning when studying the staff of the civil service of the Later Empire, as well as the much-discussed links between the bureaucracy of the time and the ‘new’ landowning class.

The part of the archive published in volume XVI was found mostly together during Grenfell and Hunt’s first excavation season at Bahnasa; see **1876** introd. **4693** comes from the sixth excavation season; **4686** and **4694** possibly stem from the same excavation, but were probably not found together. We may consider whether the three new papyri lay not very far from the texts of volume XVI: in their sixth season, Grenfell and Hunt returned to the mounds partly dug in the first; see *Egypt Exploration Society Excavation Report* 16 (1906–7) 8–11.

The object of the lease has not survived, but there are several indications that it concerned city property: both parties to the transaction are said to originate or reside in the city of Oxyrhynchus, the lease is set to start in the month of Thoth (see 5 n.), and the majority of the documents in the archive are leases of house property in Oxyrhynchus.

ὑπατία Φλαουτίου Ἀνατολίου τοῦ λαμπρ(οτάτου), Θῶθ η.
 Αὐρηλίῳ Εὐλόγιῳ υἱῷ Ὠρίωνος ἀπὸ τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ
 λαμπροτ[άτ]ης Ὁξυρυγι[τ]ῶν πόλεως παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ψαείου
 υἱὸς Βησάτος καταμένο[ν]τος ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει. ἐκουσίως
 5 ἐπιδέχομαι μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος μηνὸς Θῶθ
 τ[οῦ] ἐ[ν]ε[ρ]γ[ί]ατος ἔτους ρ[ιζ] πς τῆς [παρο]ύσης ἐν[ά]της
 [ἰνδικτ]ί[ονο]ς .[

Back, downwards along the fibres:

μί(σθωσις) Ψαείου .[

1 ὑπατια, l. ὑπατεία λαμπρ 4 υἱος, l. υἱοῦ 8 ♀

‘In the consulship of Flavius Anatolius, *vir clarissimus*, Thoth 8.

‘To Aurelius Eulogius, son of Horion, from the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, from Aurelius Psaeius, son of Besas, residing in the same city. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from the present month of Thoth of the current year 117/86 of the present ninth indiction . . .’

Back: ‘Lease of Psaeius . . .’

1 For the consulship, see *CLRE* 414–15; cf. 416–17; see also **4687** introd. para. 2. For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 82, 96.

2 *Ἀύρηλίω Εὐλογίω*. This is the only text in which Eulogius occurs with the *gentilicium* Aurelius. The transition from Aurelius to Flavius is also documented in the case of his sons: contrast e.g. XVI 1961 (487), referring to Aurelii Martyrius and Apphus, with XVI 1962 = SB XVI 12583 (500), in which the two brothers appear as Flavii.

᾽Ωρίωνος. Cf. 4693 4, 4694 4. In XVI 1958 4 Eulogius' patronymic was read as ᾽Ωριγγέ[ου]ς, which may be corrected to ᾽Ωρίων[ο]ς; although the papyrus is very abraded at this point, the new reading is hardly in doubt.

5 ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος μηνὸς Θώθ. Many Oxyrhynchite leases of buildings are set to begin in the month of Thoth; see H. Müller, *Untersuchungen zur MISOΘΩΣΙΣ von Gebäuden im Rechte der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri* (1985) 180–1.

6 For Oxyrhynchite era year 117/86 = 440/1, see *CSBE* 82.

N. GONIS

4687. LEASE OF LAND

30 4B.39/C(1-4)b

15.5 × 15.5 cm

26 May 441
Plate XIV

This text, of which only the upper right part is preserved, is a lease of three aruras in the possession of an Oxyrhynchite *curialis* whose name has not survived; a reference to the acquisition history of the land is included, but the details are lost. The lease is likely to have been of indefinite duration, cf. P. Mich. XI 611 (412), P. Berl. Zill. 7 (574), LVIII 3955 (611), etc.

The text is of considerable interest for its postconsular dating clause. The consuls of 440 were Valentinianus Aug. V and Fl. Anatolius. 'Up to May or June, only Anatolius was disseminated in the East; the order in [*Fasti*] *Heracleani*] reflects the fact that Valentinian was added only subsequently. The laws were all corrected except *NovTheod* 19 [20.v.440], but the papyri never do show Valentinian's fifth consulate' (*CLRE* 415). 4687 now shows that Valentinian was eventually disseminated in Egypt.

The first four lines seem to be in a different hand from that responsible for the rest of the document. The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

- (m. 1) [† μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δε]σπότης ἡ[μῶν] Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου
 [(vac.) Ἀύγουστου τὸ ε κα]ὶ Φλ(αουίου) Ἀνα[τολίου τ]οῦ λαμπρο(τάτου), Παῦνι α.
 [c.15]ω τῶ αἰδεσίμω πολιτεομένω τῆς λαμπρᾶς
 [καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὁ]ξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως παρὰ Ἀύρηλίου Τραειανοῦ
 5 (m. 2) [ἀπὸ ἐποικίου c.4 -]μῶνος τῆς σῆς θαυμασιότητος τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ.
 [έκουσίως ἐπιδέχ]ομαι μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους
 [ριζ πς σπορᾶς τ]ῆς δεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων
 [c.25] τῆς σῆς πολιτείας ἥτοι πρώην
 [c.8 ἐν πεδίοις κώμης Μερ]μέρθων ἐδάφους Γεροντίου
 10 [καλουμένου c.14 ἀ]ρούρας τρεῖς εἰς σπορὰν ὧν
 [ἐὰν αἰρῶμαι γεννημάτων καὶ τελ]έσω ὑπ[έρ] φ[όρου] ἀποτάκτου

2 φλς λαμπρ° 4 I. Τραϊανού

‘After the consulship of our master Valentinianus, the eternal Augustus, for the 5th time, and Flavius Anatolius, *vir clarissimus*, Pauni 1.

‘To . . . the revered *curialis* of the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, from Aurelius Traianus from the farmstead of —mon, of your admirableness, of the said nome. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from the current year 117/86, for the sowing of the tenth indiction, from the property belonging . . . your city (?), that is, formerly . . . in the lands of the village of Mermertha, of a ground called ‘Of Gerontius’, . . . three aruras, for the sowing of whatever crops I may choose, and I shall pay as fixed rent . . .’

1–2 For the consuls see above, introd.

2 Ἀνα[τολίου. A reading Ἀνθ[εμίου, i.e., a dating by Valentinianus Aug. VIII and Fl. Anthemius v.c. coss. 455, should probably be ruled out, even if spacing is inconclusive, and the remains of the letter on the edge of the break, a short left-hand curve, would not exclude θ. The news of the death of Valentinian (on 16.iii.455) and of the consuls of the year became known in Egypt towards the middle of September 455; see *ZPE* 138 (2001) 140. All Egyptian instances of that consulate known to date (P. Münch. III.1 102 of 20.ix.455; P. Yale I 71 of 28.viii.456; P. Bodl. I 52 of 11.iii.457, cf. *ZPE* 138 (2001) 140) indicate that it was common knowledge that Valentinian was no longer alive. But **4687** refers to him as if he were among the living, so that it cannot have had a date by the postconsulate of 455.

3–4 πολιτενομένῳ τῆς λαμπρᾶς | [καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀ]ξυρρυχιτῶν πόλεως. Cf. **4678** 3–4 n. That this *curialis* is to be identified with Fl. Strategius, *curator* of the *domus divina*, attested as in **L 3584**, is one possibility, cf. below 9 n.

5 ἐποικίου c.4 -]μῶνος τῆς cῆς θαυμασιότητος τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ. Κνα]μῶνος is an attractive possibility: this settlement occurs in **XIX 2244** ii 9 (VI) immediately after entries referring to Mermertha, mentioned here in l. 9. For the collocation cf. **XXXIV 2724** 6–7 (469) ἀπὸ ἐποικίου Χαῖρᾶ κτήματος τῆς | cῆς θαυμασιότητος τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ.

7 Oxyrhynchite era year 117/86 = 440/1; see *CSBE* 82. Cf. **4686** 6.

σπορᾶς. For the supplement, cf. P. Mich. XI 611.7 (412), P. Oslo II 35.10 (426, cf. BL VII 124), **L 3582** 5 (442), **VI 913** 8 (443, cf. BL VII 132), **LXIII 4390** 7 (469).

σπορᾶς τ]ῆς δεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος. Cf. **4677** 9 n. The reference is to the fiscal indiction, which started on 1 May 441.

8–9 At the beginning of 8, perhaps restore [κοι καὶ περιελθόντων εἰς cὲ ὑπὸ], which would fit the space; for the construction, cf. e.g. **LXIII 4390** 8 (469), **SB XVI 12946.3** (474), P. Flor. III 325.7 (489, cf. BL VII 53), P. Mich. XI 612.9–10 (514). At the start of 9, there probably stood the name of the previous owner.

The land under lease was previously the property of someone other than the lessor, and the city seems to have played a role in determining the current status of the land. The situation might be comparable to that in P. Flor. III 325 (489), discussed by I. F. Fichman, ‘Kurienland in Oxyrhynchos?’, in *Festschrift zum 150jährigen Bestehen des Berliner Ägyptischen Museums* (1974) 343–6: in that text, Fl. Strategius II, in the capacity of *curialis*, seems to have received through the *boule* the fourth share of the estate of a deceased *curialis* (in l. 8, for γεναμένον πρίνκιπος read γεναμένου πολιτενομένου — unpublished correction of K. A. Worp, reported to me by R. Pintaudi, whom I thank).

9 Μερ]μέρθων. A village in the southern part of the Oxyrhynchite nome (Upper Toparchy; 1st pagus); see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell’Ossirinchi* (1981) 103–5, with **LXIII 4390** 6 n. Is it a mere coincidence that Fl. Isis, *femina clarissima*, held an estate in the area of this village, inherited from her father, ‘Strategius of glorious memory’ (= Fl. Strategius I)? The latter is probably the sometime *curator* of the *domus divina*, an early representative of the Apion family.

Γεροντίου. This location is not known otherwise.

9–10 For the supplements cf. **SB III 6612.8–9** (365) and P. Mich. XI 611.8–9 (412). In **VI 913** 9–10, where

the edition prints ἐν πεδίῳ τῆς ἡμετέρας κώμης ἐδάφους | [τσιτικοῦ, it is more likely that the lacuna carried away the name of the ἐδάφος than *τσιτικοῦ*. For the expression, cf. also P. Oslo II 35.13, as read in *ZPE* 141 (2002) 161, and **4677** 11.

10–11 Cf. LXIII **4390** 15–16 (469), P. Flor. III 325.13 (489), PSI I 77.21–2 (551; cf. BL VII 232). A similar collocation should perhaps be restored in LXIII **4379** 12–14, edited thus:

μίαν c.5–10 ἑκκαίδε]κατον δυοτρι[ακοστὸν ὥστε ταύτας
 σπείραι καὶ ξυλαμῆσαι οὗς ἐ]ὰν αἰρώμα[ι
 c.20 letters] . ακτο[

The editor considered the possibility of restoring χωρὶς ἰάτε]ως καὶ ὄχομενίου, φόρου ἀπο]τάκτο[v (see **4379** 13–14 n.), which would produce a formulation last attested in a text of 266. But this is not necessary. It is conceivable that δυοτρι[ακοστὸν was followed by one further fraction of the arura, such as the one for 1/64, which would fill the space at the end of line 12 and the beginning of 13. Thus I suggest reading the following text:

μίαν c.5–10 ἑκκαίδε]κατον δυοτρι[ακοστὸν τετρα-
 καιεξηκοστὸν εἰς σπορὰν ὄν ἐ]ὰν αἰρώμα[ι γενημάτων
 καὶ τελέσω ὑπὲρ φόρου ἀπο]τάκτο[v

N. GONIS

4688. DEED OF SURETY

119/50(b)

11.2 × 16 cm

1 May – 24 June 442?
 Plate XV

The upper right part of a deed of surety concerning two farmers, addressed to an Oxyrhynchite *curialis* whose name is lost. The papyrus breaks off at the point where the duties of the persons under surety were about to be described. By analogy with P. Heid. IV 306 (413), we may assume that the farmers were obliged to remain in their hamlet and work on the land; see below 11 n. In Oxyrhynchus such deeds of surety become common from the sixth century onwards, and uniformly involve *ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί* (*coloni adscripticii*). But P. Heid. 306 and **4688** come from a time when that class of agricultural workers had not become *ἐναπόγραφοι*. For a list of Oxyrhynchite deeds of surety (fifth to seventh centuries) see G. Bastianini, in *Miscellanea Papyrologica* (Pap. Flor. VII: 1980) 26; documents published since are LVIII **3959**, P. Heid. IV 306, P. Wash. Univ. I 24, 25, 26, SB XVIII 13949, 14006, and now **4688** and **4703**.

The main interest of the document resides in its indictional date. The text, which carries a postconsular dating by Fl. Cyrus cos. 441, was written some day in Pachon or Pauni of an eleventh indiction. If we assume that at Oxyrhynchus this indiction 11 ran from 29 August 442 to 28 August 443, the date of the papyrus should fall between 26 April (Pachon 1) and 24 June (Pauni 30) 443. But a postconsular dating to the consuls of 442 is attested in SB XX 14425 of 24 April (Pharmouthi 29) 443. This could be another case of conflicting consular dates; cf. R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *BASP* 17 (1980) 28–32. But if the indiction were reckoned from 1 May, or if the scribe used the ἀρχῆ ἢ ἰνδικτίωνος formula, the difficulty disappears. See further above, **4681** 9–11 n., and below, 2 n. and 3 n.

Four vertical panels are visible. The writing is along the fibres on what was the recto

of the roll, as shown by a kollesis running close to the right edge. The back is blank except for a few ink spots, apparently offsets.

[] χμγ
 [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλα]ουίου Κύρου τοῦ λαμπρο(τάτου), Πα[. . . n]
 [] α, ἰνδικτίονος ἐν Ὁξυρύγχων []
 [c.15 τῷ αἰ]δεσίμῳ πολιτευομένῳ τ[ῆ]ς
 5 [λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτά]της Ὁξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως Α[ῦρ]ήλιος
 [c.14 ἀπὸ τῆ]ς αὐτῆς π[ό]λεως χαίρειν. [ὁ]μολογῶ
 [ἐπομνύμενος Θεὸν τὸν π]αντοκράτορα καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν τῶν
 [τὰ πάντα νικῶντων]υ δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Φλ(αουίω)ν Θεοδο[σίου]
 [Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ τῶν αἰωνί]ων Ἀγούστων ἐκουσία καὶ αὐθαι-
 10 [ρέτω γνώμη ἐγγυᾶσθαι καὶ] ἀναδεδέχθαι Ἀρρηλίους Καρμάτην
 [c.15 ἀμφοτ]έρους γεωργοὺς ἀπὸ ἐποικίου

 2 φλα]ουίου λαμπρ° 7 l. εὐσέβειαν 8 φλς

‘643. After the consulship of Flavius Cyrus, *vir clarissimus*, Pa— [n], indiction 11, at Oxyrhynchus.

‘To . . . the revered *curialis* of the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelius . . . from the same city, greetings. I acknowledge, swearing by almighty God and the piety of our all-conquering masters Flavii Theodosius (and) Valentinianus, the eternal Augusti, that of my own free will and choice I stand as surety and have undertaken the responsibility for Aurelii Sarmates and . . . both (of them) farmers from the hamlet . . .’

¹ χμγ. Cf. **4689** I, **4695** I, **4696** I, **4697** I, **4698** I. On this Christian symbol, which, following D. Hagedorn, P. Heid. IV 333.1 n., I take to represent an isopsephism for Θεὸς βοηθός, see the references in CPR XXIII 34.1 n. **4688** and **4689** now become the earliest dated instances of the symbol in documents from Oxyrhynchus, though there are attestations in papyri assigned palaeographically to the late fourth or early fifth century.

² At the end of the line restore Πα[χών or Πα[ῦνι; for the implications see above, introd.

On the consulship, see *CLRE* 416–17; cf. 442. The consular date clauses of 441–2 have caused difficulty; see R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *BASP* 17 (1980) 29, and *CLRE* 417. Cyrus, better known as a poet from Panopolis, was the consul of 441, but fell from grace in the summer of that year. ‘He did not suffer *damnatio memoriae*, though the fact that P. Mil. II 64.1 reverts to the p.c. of 440 might be interpreted as a sign of caution’ (*CLRE* *ibid.*). This statement needs qualification. According to Bagnall and Worp, *ZPE* 28 (1978) 226 (= BL VII 103), P. Mil. 64 contains a postconsular formula of Fl. Anatolius cos. 440, and should date to 6 December 441; some three months earlier, Heracleopolis dated by the consulship of Cyrus (P. Rain. Cent. 94). The postconsular formula of P. Mil. 64 relies on restoration, as well as on reading the indiction figure in line 9 as δ[ε]κάτης (ἐνάτης ed. pr.). But the published photograph (Tav. XXV = O. Montevicchi, *La Papirologia* Tav. 95) supports the reading of ed. pr.: although Δ could well be read in place of ε, the break is not wide enough to accommodate ε and the largest part of the putative κ. As for the consular formula, the restored μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν would certainly account for the space better than ὑπατείας; in that case, μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν would be a mistake for ὑπατείας, which would not be without parallel.

Alternatively, one may consider whether the scribe wrote *ὑπατείας* and left a blank space after it, but perhaps this is less likely. The dating of P. Mil. 64 to 441 also appears anomalous in view of the postconsular clause of **4687**, as well as of the postconsular datings to Cyrus; cf. the table below. P. Mil. 64 should therefore be dated to 440; Cyrus' fall from imperial favour was not reflected in his consular clauses.

When the consuls of 442 were disseminated in Egypt is not known. SB XX 14425 is dated p.c. Fl. Eudoxii & Dionysii, but Eudoxius' Western colleague in the consulship was Dioscorus, so that this must be an error for p.c. Eudoxii & Dioscori; see J. Gascou, K. A. Worp, *CRIPEL* 10 (1988) 139–40. Eudoxius and Dioscorus are attested in the postconsular formula of VI **913**, of 16 October 443 (cf. BL VII 132). On 13 November 443 a scribe in Middle Egypt (Heracleopolis) dated by Petronius Maximus II and Fl. Paterius coss. 443 (CPR X 39, largely restored, but probably certain; the alternative would be a date in 503, but the hand has a decisively earlier look).

In conclusion, the Egyptian consular datings of the period 440–3 may be tabulated as follows:

P. Harr. I 87	Fl. Anatolio v.c. cos.	Epeiph 3	27.vi.440
LXVIII 4686	Fl. Anatolio v.c. cos.	Thoth 8, ind. 9	5.ix.440
P. Mil. II 64	Fl. Anatolio v.c. cos. (?)	Choiak 10, ind. 9	6.xii.440
LXVIII 4687	p.c. D. N. Valentiniani Aug. V & Fl. Anatolii v.c.	Pauni 1, ind. 10	26.v.441
P. Rain. Cent 94	Fl. Cyro Hierace v.c. cos.	Thoth 7	4.ix.441
BGU II 609	Fl. Cyro v.c. cos.	Hathyr 16, ind. 11	^a 12.xi.441
SB XIV 11434	p.c. Fl. Cyri v.c.	Phamenoth	25.ii – 26.iii.442
LXVIII 4688	p.c. Fl. Cyri v.c.	Pachon/Pauni, ind. 11	1.v – 24.vi.442
LXVIII 4689	p.c. Fl. Cyri v.c.	Thoth 1, ind. 11	29.viii.442
LXVIII 4690	p.c. Fl. Cyri v.c.	Thoth 13	10.ix.442
SB XX 14425	p.c. Fl. Eudoxii & Dionysii (<i>sic</i>) vv.cc.	Pharmuthi 29, ind. 11	24.iv.443
VI 913	p.c. Fl. Eudoxii & Dioscori vv.cc.	Phaophi 18	16.x.443
CPR X 39	Fl. Maximo II & Paterio vv.cc. coss.	Hathyr 16	13.xi.443

^a or 442, if cos. a mistake for p.c.

3 *ι|a*, *ἰνδικτίωνος*. For the implications of the indictional date see above, introd. I have considered the possibility that the papyrus had *ἀρχῆ|ιa*, *ἰνδικτίωνος*, but this would be unusual in an Oxyrhynchite text of this date, since the *ἀρχῆ* formula is not attested earlier than 473 (LIX **3985**); the formula is normally presented as *ἰνδικτίωνος x*, *ἀρχῆ* of $x + 1$, though LXII **4349** 1 (504) and XVI **1994** 2 (505), as well as the Cynopolite P. Köln III 151.3–4 (423) have the shortened formulation *ἀρχῆ* of x *ἰνδικτίωνος*. I would exclude that the papyrus had *ι ἰνδικτίωνος ἀρχῆ|ιa*, *ἰνδικτίωνος*, even if there were space for it: *ἰνδικτίωνος* would not have been written twice.

A further point of interest is that this is the second earliest mention of the indiction in the dating clause of an Oxyrhynchite document, after BGU III 936 = *W.Chr.* 123 (30.iv.426); cf. K. A. Worp, *APF* 33 (1987) 94.

4–5 *πολιτευομένω τ[η]ς [λαμπράς καὶ λαμπροτά]της Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως*. Cf. **4678** 3–4 n.

7–9 For this form of the imperial oath see K. A. Worp, *zPE* 45 (1982) 207–8; cf. Z. M. Packman, *zPE* 100 (1994) 207. For the restored *ἐπομνύμενος* in 7, cf. XVI **1880** 13 and **1881** 15 (both of 427) — the more common *ὀμνύε* would be too short for the space.

8 [*τὰ πάντα νικῶντω*]ν seems short for the space, but I do not see what else could have been lost.

Φλ(αουῖων). The abbreviation used suggests reading *Φλ(αουῖου)*, but XVI **1881** 16 (427), where the word is written out in full, may imply that *Φλαουῖων* was meant. CPR VI 6.13 (Herm.; 439) has *Φλ(αουῖου) Θεοδοσίου Φλ(αουῖου) Οὐαλεντινιανού*.

9 For the postulated omission of *καί* between the names of the emperors, see D. Hagedorn, *zPE* 10 (1973) 172, and P. J. Sijpesteijn, *zPE* 62 (1986) 142.

11 The lacuna must have carried away Sarmates' patronymic as well as the second farmer's name and patronymic. But there does not seem to be enough space for three names in the break, even if these were short. Perhaps one or even both of the patronymics were not given, which would be unusual, or the two farmers were brothers.

ἀμφοτ]έρου γεωργούς. On this kind of agricultural labourer see J. Banaji, *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity* (2001) 190–2, 231–2; cf. LXVII **4616** 7–8 n. It should be specified that *ἐναπογρά]φους* is not a possible reading.

The duties the two farmers were to perform are unknown, but one may compare P. Heid. IV 306 (413), a surety for a person πα]ραμένοντ[α] ἐν τῷ αὐ]τῷ ἐποικείῳ καὶ ὑπ[ουργούντ]α πάντα τὰ γεουχικὰ | ἔργα κα[ὶ μὴ] ἀπολλυμ[πανόμ]εν[ο]ν; cf. also P. Wisc. I 12 (345), P. Oslo III 113 (346), P. Fouad I 20 (441-4, cf. BL VII 55), or P. Vind. Sijp. 7 (463, cf. BL VIII 199).

N. GONIS

4689. LEASE OF PART OF A HOUSE

2 iB.102/G(b)

16. 4 × 15.2 cm

29 August 442

The upper part of a lease of a three-quarter share of a house, the lessor being a *stationarius*. The lease was probably of indefinite tenure, terminable at the will of the lessor. The amount of rent is lost. The house was located in the ἄμφοδον Ἐξαγορ(ε)ίου, a new Oxyrhynchite quarter.

χμγ

μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν Φλ(αουῖου) Κύρου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου,
Θῶθ α.

Φλαουῖῳ Ἰσακ στατιωναρίῳ υἱῷ Ἡεσυχίου

5 ἀπὸ τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρυγγι-
τῶν πόλεως παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ἀνουθίου υἱοῦ Παμουνίου
λευκαντοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως. ἐκουσίως
ἐπιδέχομαι μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος μηνὸς
Θῶθ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους ριθ πη τῆς ἐνδεκάτης

10 ἰνδικτιῶνος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων σοι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει
ἐπ' ἀμφοδου Ἐξαγορίου ἡμῖν τέταρτον μέρος
ἐκ [τ]ῆς ὀλοκλήρου οἰκίας σὺν χρη[στ]ηρίοις πᾶσι κ[αὶ]

Back, downwards along the fibres:

(m. 2) μίσθ(ωσις) Ἀνουθίου λ[ευκαντοῦ]

2 1. ὑπατίαν ὑπατιαν φλς 4 φλαουῖῳ ἰσακ υἱῳ 6 υἱοῦ 10 ἰνδικτιῶνος ὑπαρχοντων
11 1. Ἐξαγορείου 13 μισθ

643. After the consulship of Flavius Cyrus, *vir clarissimus*, Thoth 1.

‘To Flavius Isac, *stationarius*, son of Hesychius, from the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, from Aurelius Anuthius son of Pamunius, bleacher, from the same city. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from the present month of Thoth of the current year 119/88 of the eleventh indiction, from the property belonging to you in the

same city in the quarter of the Proclamation Hall, a three-quarter share of the whole house with all (its) appurtenances and . . .'

Back: 'Lease of Anuthius, bleacher . . .'

2 On the consulship of Flavius Cyrus, see **4688** 2 n.

4 Φλαουίω Ἰδὰκ στατιωναρίω. This *stationarius* is not known from elsewhere. On the office, see LXIII **4382** 2 n., LXVI **4529** 8 n.

7 λευκαντοῦ. On this occupation, see LIX **3987** introd. para. 2.

9 Oxyrhynchite era year 119/88 = 442/3, and indiction 11 = 442/3; see *CSBE* 82.

11 ἀμφόδου Ἐξαγορίου. This district of Oxyrhynchus appears to be new. It seems to have been named after a place called ἔξαγόρειον; see LXIV **4441** v 13 n.; cf. J. R. Rea, *ZPE* 79 (1989) 202.

12 ἐκ [τ]ῆς ὀλοκλήρου οἰκίας. This syntagm has not been found in any other papyrus, though cf. SB VI 8987.14, 20 (644/5) ἐκ τῆς πάσης οἰκίας.

N. GONIS

4690. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEBT

93/Dec. 27/C.1

18.5 × 14 cm

10 September 442

The upper right part of what seems to be an acknowledgement of indebtedness. An Oxyrhynchite whose name is lost appears to have borrowed a number of solidi from Athanasius, *curialis*; his guarantor for the repayment of the loan was a certain Aurelius Petrus son of Leontius. The debt was probably paid through the guarantor; in this text the borrower acknowledges that he owes Petrus a sum that would make up the total of the money guaranteed.

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

[μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαου]ίου Κύρου τοῦ λαμπρο(τάτου), Θῶθ ιγ//.
 [c.18] ἀμμωνος ἀ[πὸ] τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρυχιτῶν
 [πόλεως Ἀὐρηλίω Πέ]τρω υἱῷ Λεοντίου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ
 [ὀφείλειν σοὶ καὶ χρεωστεῖν εἰς συμπλήρωσιν τῶν ἀντιφωνηθέντων παρὰ σοῦ
 5 [c.18]]. διδόναι ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ Ἀθανασίω πολιτενομένῳ διὰ Θεοδώρου
 [c.5 χρυσοῦ νομισμάτια ἀπ]λ[ᾶ] δε[σπο]τικ[ᾶ] εὔσταθμα δόκιμα ἀριθμῶ
 [c.27 ἀκίνδυνα] παντὸς κινδύνου ἐπάναγκες
 [ἀποδώσω c.28] . . . [τ]οῦ ἐ[νεστ]ῶτος ἔτο[υς ριθ πη]
 [c.50] . . . [c.8]

1 λαμπρο

3 υἱῶ

'After the consulship of Flavius Cyrus, *vir clarissimus*, Thoth 13.

' . . . of —ammon, from the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, to Aurelius Petrus son of Leontius, from the same city, greetings. I acknowledge that I owe

you and am indebted, to complete the . . . guaranteed by you . . . to give on my behalf to Athanasius, *curialis*, through Theodorus . . . pure, imperial, of full weight, approved solidi of gold . . . in number . . . free from all risk, I shall of necessity repay . . . of the present year 119/88 . . .¹

1 On the consulship, see **4688** 2 n. The restoration of the postconsulate is suggested by spacing. This would be the latest known Egyptian dating by the postconsulate of Fl. Cyrus.

4 [ὀφέειλεν σοι καὶ χρεωστειί]ν. The restorations are by no means secure, even if one may adduce **VI 914** 6–7 (486), **PSI III 246.9–10** (526), possibly **SB XIV 11601.6–7** (489?), and a number of ‘sales in advance of delivery’ such as **XVI 1973** 8 (420), **X 1320** 7 (497), **XVI 1974** 9–10 (538, cf. **BL VII 173**), etc.

ἀντιφωνηθέντων. See **LIX 4007** 4 n.; cf. **P. Köln VII 319.8** n. with references.

5 At the start of the line restore e.g. [νομιματίων ἐπὶ τῷ ε]ξ.

Ἀθανασίῳ πολιτευομένῳ. He is probably the same as the one addressed in **P. Mil. II 45.3** (449) as Φλαουτίῳ Ἀ[θ]ανασίῳ τῷ αἰδεσίμῳ πολ(ιτευομένῳ) καὶ ῥιπαρίῳ. **VII 1048** 5, which mentions a πλ(οίων) Ἀθανασίου πολ(ιτευομένου), must refer to a different person, since the text cannot be much later than the very beginning of the fifth century. This Athanasius should not be confused with the βουλευτής whose ship is mentioned in **P. Harr. I 94.4** (IV); the latter might be identical with the προπολιτευόμενος of this name in **XLVIII 3394** 16 (364–6?), see **ZPE 143** (2003) 164–5. Thus it seems that from mid fourth to mid fifth century there were at least three persons of this name who were members of the *ordo curialis* of Oxyrhynchus (cf. **K. A. Worp, ZPE 115** (1997) 218).

8 For the restored era year 119/88, cf. **4689** g. A reference to the indiction current, i.e. τῆς ἐνδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος, may have followed in l. 9.

N. GONIS

4691. TOP OF DOCUMENT

106/89(c)

6.3 × 4.8 cm

16 April 453

To judge from the prescript, the original document was probably a contract. Its post-consular date clause supplements the details furnished by **4692**.

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

[μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαουτίου] Σπορακίου τοῦ λαμπρο(τάτου)
 [καὶ τοῦ δηλωθησομένου, Φαρ]μούθι κα.
 [c.20 (-)αν]τινόου ἀπὸ κώμησ
 [c.25] . . [c.4] ξ . . υ

2 λαμπρο

‘After the consulship of Flavius Sporacius, *vir clarissimus*, and of the (consul) to be announced, Pharmouthi 21.

‘ . . . son of —antinous from the village . . . ’

1–2 On the consulship see **4692** 1–2 n. Line 2 is restored after **4692** 2.

3 (-)αν]τινόου. This is part of the patronymic of the person whose name is lost in the break.

N. GONIS

4692. FRAGMENT OF A LEASE

85/36(c)

11 × 9.5 cm

31 July 453

The upper right part of a lease; that both contracting parties are said to originate or reside in the city of Oxyrhynchus, and that the lease is set to start in the month of Thoth, may suggest that the object of the lease was city property.

The text is of interest for its postconsular formula, which furnishes the latest instance of the (post)consulship of 452; see below 1–2 n.

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

[μετὰ τὴν ὑπατ]είαν Φλαουτίου Σπορακίου τοῦ
 [λαμπρο(τάτου) καὶ τ]οῦ δηλωθησομένου, Μεσορῆ ζ.
 [Ἀυρήλιος c.4] . c υἱὸς Πέτρου ἀπὸ τῆς Ὁξυρυγχιτῶν
 [πόλεως Ἀυρηλί]ω Ἰερακίω νιῶ Πεκυσίου
 5 [c.12]! ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως. ἐκουσίως
 [ἐπιδέχομαι μισ]θώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θώθ
 [τοῦ εἰσιόντος ἔτους] ρλ ρθ τῆς ἐβδόμης | [ἰνδικτίωνος

After the consulship of Flavius Sporacius, *vir clarissimus*, and of the (consul) to be announced, Mesore 7.

Aurelius — son of Petrus, from the city of the Oxyrhynchites, to Aurelius Hieracion son of Pecysius, (now resident?) at the said city. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from Thoth of the coming year 130/99 of the seventh indiction . . .'

1–2 On the consulship of Fl. Sporacius cos. 452, see *CLRE* 439; cf. 441; cf. also Bagnall and Worp, *BASP* 17 (1980) 33. Its other occurrences in papyri are in P. Vind. Sijp. 11 of 17 February 453, and **4691** of 16 April 453. P. Vind. Sijp. 11.1–3, from Hermopolis, offers a very elaborate version of the consular clause: [μετὰ τὴν ὑ]πατε(αν) Φλα[υ]ῖ[ο]υ Σπορακίου τοῦ μεγαλοπρ(επεστάτου) | [κα]! ἀ[ν]δρ[ε]ῖο[υ]τάτου κ[α]! τῶν (l. τοῦ) ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας δηλ[ω]θησομένου. The consuls of 453 may first occur in a papyrus on 17 November (SPP XX 138, cf. BL IX 346–7; the papyrus could also date from 454).

5 What stood at the beginning of the line is not clear. [τὰ νῦν διάγοντ]! or οἰκοῦντ]! would fit, but before that one expects an indication of the person's *σῆγο*. [καταμένοντ]! or [γεουχοῦντ]! would be too short for the space.

6 μισ]θώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θώθ. The collocation does not seem to have occurred elsewhere. We expect μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ νεομηνίας τοῦ (or ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος μηνός) Θώθ. That the lease is set to start in the month of Thoth offers an indication that the object of this lease was a building; see **4686** 5 n. Cf. also **4682** 8–9 n.

7 Oxyrhynchite era year 130/99 corresponds to 453/4; see *CSBE* 82; indiction 7 also ran from 453 to 454.

N. GONIS

4693. LEASE OF A ROOM

64 6B.60/K(1-3)a

18.8 × 18.2 cm

27 (?) February 466

This is the earliest dated document attesting Eulogius as a Flavius and in the capacity of *palatinus*, antedating XVI 1958 by some ten years; cf. also 4694. A further point of interest is that this is the first text from Egypt attesting the consuls of 465.

The object of the lease is a room (*μονόχωρον*); the lessee is a woman, native of Oxyrhynchus. The rent to be paid was 1,000+ myriads. The duration of the lease is not specified, but was probably terminable at the will of the lessor.

Like most other items of the archive, the papyrus has suffered much from abrasion, but very few readings are in doubt.

⚭ ὑπατείας Φλ(αουίων) [Βα]σιλίσκου καὶ Ἑρμενεριχ τῶν λαμπροτάτων,
Φ[α]μενώθ γ, δ' ἰνδικ(τίωνος).

Φλαουίῳ Εὐλογίῳ τῷ καθωσιωμένῳ παλατίνῳ
νιῷ τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Ὀρίωνος ἀπὸ τῆς
5 λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὁξ[υ]ρυγχιτῶν πό[λε]ως
παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Πίνας θυγατρὸς[ε] Σαραπάμω[νος]
ἀπὸ τῆς α[υ]τῆς πόλεως. ἐκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι
μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ [τ]οῦ ὄντος μηνὸς Φαμενώ[θ]
τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος[ος] ἑτ[ου]ς ρμβ ρια τῆς παρούσης[ης]
10 τετάρτης[ε] ἰνδ[ικ]τί[ο]νος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων
τῆς αἰ ἐγγενείᾳ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει ἐπ' ἀμφόδου Ἰππέων
Παρεμβολῆς ὀλόκληρον μονόχωρον νεῦον ἐπὶ βορρᾶ
κὺν χρηστ[η]ρίοις καὶ δικαίοις πάσι· καὶ τελέσῃ ὑπὲρ
[ἐνοι]κίῳ[υ] ἑνιαυσίως ἀργυρίου μυριάδας χιλίας
15 [3-4]κος[ί]ας, [ὄπερ ἐνοίκιον] ἀπο[δ]ώσω κατ' ἕτος
δ[ι]εξ[α]μήνου τὸ ἥμισυ· καὶ ὅταν β[ου]ληθῆ[ε] παρα[δ]ώσ[ω]

Back, downwards along the fibres:

⚭ μίςθ(ωσις) Πίνα[ε] traces

1 ὑπατείας	φλλ (?)	ερμενεριχ'	2 ἰνδικ	3 φλαουίω	1. καθωσιωμένῳ	4 νιῷ
10 ὑπαρχοντων	11 ἰπ'πεων	12 βορ'ρα	13 1. κύν	ὑπερ	17 μίς ^θ	

'In the consulship of Flavii Basiliscus and Hermenerich, *viri clarissimi*, Phamenoth 3 (?), indiction 4.

‘To Flavius Eulogius, the *devotissimus palatinus*, son of Horion of blessed memory, from the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, from Aurelia Pina, daughter of Sarapammon, from the same city. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from the present month of Phamenoth of the current year 142/111 of the present fourth indiction from the property belonging to your nobility in the same city in the quarter of Hippeon Parembole, a whole single room facing north with all appurtenances and rights, and I shall pay as rent annually one thousand . . . hundred myriads of silver, which rent I shall pay each year, one half every six months; and whenever you may wish I shall surrender . . .’

Back: ‘Lease of Pina . . .’

1 ‘*Ἐρμενεριχ*. A short oblique stroke added high after χ may serve to indicate that this is a foreign name.

1–2 Basiliscus and Hermenerich were the consuls of 465; see *CLRE* 464–5. This is their first occurrence in a papyrus, though their names are perhaps to be restored in P. Prag. I 44, which would then date to 25.ii – 26.iii.466 (so F. Reiter, in an unpublished note reported in *Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens*, version Beta 1.0).

The indiction (ll. 2, 10) and Oxyrhynchite era year (l. 9) point to 466; see *CSBE* 83. *ὑπατείας* should therefore stand for *μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν*, a common mistake; cf. *CSBE* 50–4, with *BASP* 15 (1978) 234. Like **4693**, most of the examples date ‘from the early months of the year, when such an error is most natural’. Transmission of the names of the consuls for the year 465 was late: on 16 October 465 Oxyrhynchus still dated by the postconsulate of the consuls of 464 (P. Heid. IV 331).

3 *παλατίνω*. *Palatini* were ‘all civil servants in the palatine ministries, officials of the *res privata* and the largitiones, the field army’ (LXIII **4370** 9 n.). Eulogius is described as *palatinus* in all texts mentioning him except for **4686**, which dates from before he joined the civil service, and XVI **1960** 4 (511) *γεναμένου μαγιστριανού*, a posthumous reference; but contrast **1961** 6 (487) *γενομένου παλατίνου*, another posthumous reference. On the face of it, a *μαγιστριανός* (*agens in rebus*; but C. Gloss. Biling. II 9.31 renders *μαγιστριανός* as *magistrianus*) and a *palatinus* represent different offices; the latter was a financial official in the service of the *comes sacrarum largitionum*, see R. Delmaire, *Les institutions du Bas-Empire romain, de Constantin à Justinien* i (1995) 122 ff., the former in that of the *magister officiorum*, see B. Palme, CPR XXIII 11.4 n, and 22 introd. nn. 1–4 with references. Delmaire, *CRIPPEL* 10 (1988) 134, has argued that the term *palatinus* was sometimes used ‘pour désigner tout fonctionnaire servant au palais et pas seulement les employés des services financiers centraux’; he cites the case of Eulogius as an example, implying that an *agens in rebus* could have been described as *palatinus*. But this depends on **1960**, whose date, more than two decades after Eulogius’ death, and singular status undermine its value as evidence. With the term *μαγιστριανός* widely in use in Byzantine Egypt (for the evidence, see P. J. Sijpesteijn, *CE* 68 (1993) 165–7), it is difficult to see why a *μαγιστριανός* should consistently be called *παλατίνος* for such a long time.

6 *Πίνας*. For the name, see L **3555** 5 n.

9 Year 142/111 = 465/6; see *CSBE* 83.

11 *ἐν γενεῖα*. On this honorific abstract, see K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 115 (1997) 185.

11–12 *ἀμφοδου Ἰππέων Παρεμβολῆς*. This is the latest attestation of this Oxyrhynchite quarter; the references have been collected by S. Daris, *ZPE* 132 (2000) 217.

12 *μονόχωρον*. On the term, see now R. Hatzilambrou, *JJP* 32 (2002) 40.

13 *ἐν* (l. *ἐν*) *χρηστ[η]ρίοις*. The same assimilation of ν in P. Bad. VI 172.17 (547); see Gignac, *Grammar* i 167.

4694. LEASE OF A HOUSE

95/162(a)

12.7 × 14.8 cm

14 December 466

Another lease of a house in the possession of Eulogius, drawn up some nine months after 4693. As in 4693, the lessee is a woman. The lease was probably terminable at the will of the lessor. The rent to be paid amounts to one and a half solidi annually. Much has been lost to the left of the document, but most of the lines can be restored with reasonable certainty.

The back is blank except for one trace on the edge.

[ύπατείας τοῦ δε]επ[ό]του ἡμῶν Φλ(αουτίου) Λέοντος τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀβγούστου τὸ γ//
 [(vac.) καὶ το]ῦ δηλωθησομένου, Χοιὰκ ιη//, ε ἰνδικ(τίωνος).
 [Φλαουτίω] Εὐλό[ο]γιῶ τῷ καθοσιωμέ[ν]ω παλατίνω νιῶ
 [τοῦ τῆς μακαρία]ς μνήμης Ὁρίων[ος ἀπ]ὸ τῆς Ὁξυρυγχιτών
 5 [πόλεως c.5] . . . β. θυγάτηρ[ρ] Ὁρου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς
 [πόλεως. ἔκου]σίως ἐπι[δέχ]ομαι μισθώσασθ(αι)
 [ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰσιόντος μηνός Τ]ύβι τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος
 [ἔτους ρμγ ριβ τῆς ε ἰνδικτίω]νος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρ-
 [χόντων τῆς εἰς εὐγενεία διακεκίμ]ενων ἐπὶ τῆςδε τῆς
 10 [πόλεως ἐπ' ἀμφόδου c.8 ὀλόκ]ληρον οἰκίαν
 [εὐν χρηστηρίοις καὶ δικαίοις πᾶσι καὶ τε]λέσω ὑπὲρ ἐν-
 [οικίου ἐνιαυσίως χρυσοῦ νομισμάτι]ον ἐν ἡμῖν,
 [γίνεται] χρ(υσοῦ) νο(μισμάτιον) α ς, ὅπερ ἀποδώσω κατ' ἔτος δι' ἑξαμήνου τὸ
 [ἡμῖν c.25] . . . [c.7]

1 φλς 1. Ἀβγούστου 2 ἰνδικ 3 1. καθοσιωμένω 6 μισθώσασθς 8 ὑπαρ-

'In the consulship of our master Flavius Leo, the eternal Augustus, for the 3rd time, and of the (consul) to be announced, Choiak 18, indiction 5.

'To Flavius Eulogius, the *devotissimus palatinus*, son of Horion of blessed memory, from the city of the Oxyrhynchites, (Aurelia) . . . , daughter of Horus, from the same city. I voluntarily undertake to hold on lease from the coming month of Tybi of the current year 143/112 of the fifth indiction from the property belonging to your nobility situated in this city in the quarter of . . . , a whole house with all appurtenances and rights, and I shall pay as rent annually one and a half solidi of gold, total 1½ solidi of gold, which I shall pay each year, one half every six months . . .'

1-2 On the third consulship of the emperor Leo I, see *CLRE* 466-7. Its only other instance in the papyri is P. Rain. Cent. 104.1-2, whose consular formula adds *Ἀτοκράτορος* and has *ἀποδεχθησομένου* in place of *δηλωθησομένου*. (The text of *M.Chr.* 71.19, on which see BL VIII 225 and IX 170, is very uncertain.)

5 In the lacuna supply *Αὐρηλία*, however abbreviated.

8 For Oxyrhynchite era year 143/112 = 466/7 = indiction 5, see *CSBE* 83.

τῆς ἐ ἰνδικτίω]νος. τῆς πέμπτης ἰνδικτίω]νος would be too long for the space.

9 *τῆς ἐν ἐγγενείᾳ* is restored after **4693** 11, of the same year as **4694**, though contrast the later **1958** 11 (476) [*τῆς*] *ἀρετῆς*.

10 The name of the *ἄμφοδον* cannot be restored; Eulogius and his descendants owned property in various quarters of the city.

12 *νομισμάτιον ἐν ἡμισυ*. It is less likely that the rent amounted to 1½/3 solidi: there does not seem to be any space for *τρίτον* in the lacuna at the start of line 13.

N. GONIS

4695. TOP OF DOCUMENT

44 5B.62/F(2-5)a

15.5 × 9.8 cm

31 August 472

The upper part of an agreement between a son and a father; the details of the transaction escape us. The main body of the document begins with a statement that besides what the father had previously given to the son — then the papyrus breaks off. A settlement of claims is one possibility.

The main interest of the papyrus resides in its consular dating clause, which is the earliest Egyptian dating to the consuls of 472. It may now be established that the news of the consuls of the year reached Egypt late in the summer of 472, earlier than had been thought previously; see below 2-3 n.

χμ[μ]γ

⊕ ὑπατία Φλαουίου Μαρκιανού τοῦ λαμπροτάτου
καὶ τοῦ δηλωθησομένου, Θῶθ γ, ια ἰνδικ(τίωνος).

Αὐρήλιος Φοιβάμμων υἱὸς Ἀφφούτος

5 ἀπὸ τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρυχιτῶν
πόλεως τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ μου πατρὶ τῷ αὐτῷ
Αὐρηλίῳ Ἀφφούτι υἱῷ Ἀείωνος ἀπὸ τῆς
αὐτῆς πόλεως χαίρειν. χωρὶς τῶν
πρώην δωθέντων μοι παρὰ σοῦ ἐκ

10 [c.4] . [.] . [.] . . [. .] . ε[.] ι[. .] ατιων .

Back, downwards, along the fibres:

⊕ ὁμολ(ογία) Φοιβάμ[μ]ωνος

2 ὑπατία 1. ὑπατεία 3 υνδικ 4 υἱος 6 ι. τιμιωτάτῳ 7 υἱῷ 9 ι. δωθέντων
11 ὁμολ

‘643. In the consulship of Flavius Marcianus, *vir clarissimus*, and of the (consul) to be announced, Thoth 3, indiction 11.

‘Aurelius Phoebammon, son of Apphus, from the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, to my honoured father, the said Aurelius Apphus son of Aeion, from the said city, greetings. Apart from the . . . previously given to me by you from . . .’

Back: ‘Agreement of Phoebammon . . .’

2–3 On this consulship, see *CLRE* 478–9; cf. 481. The evidence then available led to the statement that ‘dissemination in Egypt was late’, but **4695** now shows that this did not take place later than what was the norm in fifth-century Egypt. (As late as 24 July 472, Hermopolis dated by the consuls of 471; cf. P. Rain. Cent. 105.)

The belief in the late knowledge of this consulship in Egypt stems from a problem that **4695** helps to settle. Prior to the publication of **4695**, the earliest reference to this consulship was the Hermopolite BGU XII 2150, of 8 November 472. P. Lond. V 1793, also from Hermopolis, was dated by the postconsulate of Leo Aug. IV & Probinianus coss. 471, Choiak 5, indiction 10; the postconsular date corresponds to 1 December 472, but the indictional to 1 December 471. Bagnall and Worp, *BASP* 17 (1980) 30, raised the possibility that P. Lond. 1793 ‘was mistakenly dated p.c. rather than cos.; in a century when p.c. datings are the rule, the scribe might be pardoned for assuming that any new consuls were already out of office. This, however, is the reverse of the normal error, and we remain uncertain what has happened.’ **4695** now turns the scales in favour of dating P. Lond. 1793 to 471.

6 τῷ τιμοστάτῳ (l. τιμω-) μου πατρί. This type of address is common in prescripts of private letters of the Roman period, but does not seem to have occurred in any other legal document.

10 Neither γραμματίων nor νομικματίων can be read. At the end of the line, a low trace to the right of γ may well be from a tall finishing stroke (e.g. c) at the end of the otherwise lost line below.

N. GONIS

4696. TOP OF CONTRACT

2 1B.101/D(e)

19.3 × 7.3 cm

2 September 484

The interest of this papyrus is chronological and prosopographical. It offers the earliest Egyptian record of the consulate of the Ostrogoth king Theoderic, and attests an important Oxyrhynchite *curialis*, Flavius Ioannes, *vir spectabilis*, *comes sacri consistorii*; see 4 n. An unexpected piece of information is that Ioannes’ father is Timagenes, another eminent Oxyrhynchite, active in the earlier part of the century. For the possibility that the *comites* Phoebammon and Samuel are this Ioannes’ sons, and the implications of such an identification, see **4697** introd.

The papyrus breaks off before the nature of the document appears; for the possibility that it is a receipt for a part of an irrigation machine, see below 9 n.

ΧΜΥ

ὑπατεία Φλαοῦτου Θεοδορίχου το[ῦ] λαμπροτάτου, Θὰθ ε, ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) η,
ἐν Ὁξυρύγχων.

Φλαοῦτῳ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ περιβλέπτῳ κόμετι τοῦ θείου κονιστωρίου

5 καὶ πολιτευομένῳ υἱῷ το[ῦ] τῆς λαμπρᾶς μνήμης Τιμαγένου

γεουχοῦντι ἐνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρ[ᾶ] καὶ λαμπροτάτῃ Ὁξυρρυχιτῶν
 [πό]λε[ι A] ὑρῆλιος Ἄνινος [υἱὸ]ς Ἀπ[ακύ]ρου μητρ[ὸ]ς Κασίας
 [ἀπὸ ἐποικί]ου Δ. [c.8 τού] αὐτοῦ [νομοῦ c.5] . . . [

Back, downwards along the fibres:

χειρογραφή[ία

2 ὑπατεία ἰνΔ 4 ἰωαννη

‘643. In the consulship of Flavius Theodorichus, *vir clarissimus*, Thoth 5, indiction 8, in Oxyrhynchus.

‘To Flavius Ioannes, *vir spectabilis*, *comes sacri consistorii* and *curialis*, son of Timagenes of splendid memory, landowner here in the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelius Aninus son of Apacyrus, mother Casia, from the hamlet of D— of the same nome . . .’

Back: ‘Cheirograph . . .’

2 For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 84, 96. This is the earliest Egyptian record of the consulship of Theoderic, on whom see *CLRE* 502–3; cf. 505, 507. The news of his proclamation must have reached Egypt some time in the summer of 484; as late as 4 May 484 Oxyrhynchus still dated by the postconsulate of Fl. Trocundes cos. 482 (VIII 1130; on the date, cf. *CSBE* 120, BL VIII 241). It is interesting that this is the first time since 476 that a consul becomes known in Egypt within less than a year from his appointment.

4 Φλαουῶ Ἰωάννη. R. Rémondon, *Pap. Congr. XI* (1966) 144 with n. 4, identified what he called the archive ‘du comte Jean, qui fut praeses d’Arcadie en 488’, consisting of ten items. Thanks to 4697 (489) and, to a lesser extent, 4701 (505²), we are now able to tell that there were at least two high-ranking persons of this name at Oxyrhynchus in the later fifth century:

(1) Ioannes, *vir spectabilis*, dead by 489; cf. 4697 3–4 and 4701 7, which refer to Phoebammon and Samuel as υἱοῖς τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μνήμης Ἰωάννου, indicating that in life their father was a *vir spectabilis*. He is likely to be the Ioannes of 4696.

Given his title and rank, it is tempting, though not necessarily right, to identify this Ioannes with . . . Apio Theodosius Iohannes, *vir spectabilis*, *comes sacri consistorii et praeses provinciae Arcadiae*, attested in the undated XVI 1877; the latter is presumably identical with the μεγαλοπρεπέστατος ἄρχων Ἰωάννης in XVI 1888 of 25.ix.488 (*PLRE* II 619, Ioannes 100). The fact that 1888 was issued by Φοιβάμμων κόμης, possibly the same as the one in 4697 and 4701, is not conclusive for identifying the *praeses* with Phoebammon’s father.

(2) Ioannes, *comes* (his *comitiva* is not specified), who occurs in P. Harr. I 91 of 29.xi.484 (cf. BL VIII 147), I 141 of 19.xii.503 (*PLRE* II 603, Ioannes 35), and LXVIII 4699 of 23.i.504. In theory, the *comes* of P. Harr. I 91 could be the same as the one in 4696, but the type of the text, an order to supply meat and wheat, recalls 141 and 4699. X 1335, of 482, another order to supply meat, may refer to the same man, even if Ioannes is mentioned without a title. It is unclear whether the same person is to be recognised in X 1336 (V), an order to pay money.

Either of the two *comites* may occur in the letter I 155 (VI), not mentioned by Rémondon, addressed τῷ δεσπότη μου τῷ πάντων μεγαλοπρ(επεστάτῳ) κόμ(ετι) καὶ ἐμῷ προστάτῃ Ἰωάννη.

The petition XVI 1943 (late V), submitted to Φλ. Ἰωάννη τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ ἐκδικί[ω] of Oxyrhynchus (*PLRE* II 617, Ioannes 92), is not likely to refer to the Ioannes of 4696. He could be the same as Ioannes 2, or someone else. The αἰδέμιος πολιτεύόμενος and γεουχῶν Fl. Ioannes, son of Martyrius, of XLIX 3512 (492) is probably a different person.

Apparently on the basis of **1888**, Rémondon included in the ‘archive’ the texts referring to Phoebammon and Samuel (see **4697** 3 n.). Now that we know that Phoebammon and Samuel were the sons of a Ioannes, the link appears closer than would otherwise have been thought. Ioannes’ father Timagenes was dead by 444 (cf. below); it would be plausible to assume that the son was dead by 489.

τῷ περιβλέπτῳ κόμητι τοῦ θείου κονιστωρίου. On the office, see most recently CPR XXIV pp. 59–61, 68–71. At that date, the conferral of this *comitiva* did not entail effective membership of the senate or the emperor’s consistory, but still carried considerable dignity: **1877** shows that c.488 the *praeses* of Arcadia was a *comes sacri consistorii*; cf. also P. Mich. XVIII 794.2, assigned to the late fifth century (the redating to the early sixth century suggested in CPR XXIV p. 71 n. 14 is not strictly necessary, cf. *ZPE* 132 (2000) 180 n. 6, though palaeographically it is entirely possible).

5 καὶ πολιτευομένῳ. Ioannes was of curial stock: he may well have been a *curialis* who at some stage was given the *comitiva*. Compare the case of Fl. Strategius, *curialis*, *curator* of the *domus divina*, and later *comes sacri consistorii*; see LXIII **4389** 1 n.

το[ὺ] τῆς λαμπρᾶς μνήμης Τιμαγένοῦς. The filiation is probably also attested in LV **3805** 12 (566) δ(ιὰ) τῶν κληρ(ονόμων) Ἰωάννου Τιμαγένοῦς (cf. **4697** 4 n. para. 1). Timagenes is presumably the same as an important Oxyrhynchite active earlier in the century, who is attested as a *vir clarissimus* in PSI Congr. XVII 29.3 (432) τῆ μερίδι τοῦ λαμπροτάτου Τιμαγένοῦς, and was dead by 444, having reached the grade of *spectabilis*; cf. the formulation [μερί]δι τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μνήμης Τιμαγένοῦς (L **3583** 3). The fact that he is referred to as τῆς λαμπρᾶς μνήμης here and in P. Warr. 3.2–3 (V/VI, but before 504; see BL VII 93) may suggest that posthumous references to titles or functions should not always be taken at face value. He might be the same as the *riparius* in SB XXII 15471, ed. pr. J. O’Callaghan, *CE* 70 (1995) 189–92, cf. J. Bingen’s postscript to ed. pr. (the hand suits a date early in the fifth century); if the identification holds, the twelfth and thirteenth indictions mentioned in that text should not be later than those corresponding to 428–30.

On the *μερίς* of the *οἶκος* of Timagenes, which survived into the sixth century, see J. Gasco, *T&MB* 3 9 (1985) 41–4, and P.J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 134–5 n. 1. 3. There is a great temptation to associate Phoebammon and Samuel’s appearance as representatives of this *οἶκος* in SB XX 14964 with their ancestry.

8 ἐποικίλου Δι[ου]νιαῖδος or Δι[ο]κουρίου, on which see Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell’Ossirinchie* 42–3, would just fit in the break.

9 χειρογραφή[ία]. Fifth- and sixth-century Oxyrhynchite documents described thus in the docket are mostly receipts for replacement parts of irrigation machines, cf. XXXIV **2724** 26 (469), XVI **1899** 28 (476), LXVIII **4697** 17 (489), XVI **1982** 29 (497), **1984** 10 (523), **1900** 35 (528), XXXVI **2779** 29 (530), etc.

N. GONIS

4697. RECEIPT FOR REPLACEMENT PARTS OF AN IRRIGATION MACHINE

105/193(a)

15.6 × 15 cm

27–31 December 489

The upper left part of a relatively early example of a well-attested type of document; cf. LXVII **4616** introd. It is addressed to the brothers Phoebammon and Samuel, two eminent Oxyrhynchites already known from several papyri, but whose filiation was previously unknown. This text and **4701** tell us that they were the sons of a certain Ioannes, dead by that time, who in life was a *vir spectabilis*. If this Ioannes is the same as the one in **4696**, which seems likely, Phoebammon and Samuel were the grandsons of Timagenes, who flourished in the earlier part of the century. In that case, three generations of an Oxyrhynchite landowning family of curial origin and senatorial rank would become known to us.

4697 further complements our picture of the position of Phoebammon and Samuel

within the society of late antique Oxyrhynchus. We now see them as landowners in possession of artificially irrigated farms under *ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί*, like other ennobled landowners in Oxyrhynchus at that time. In the fashion of the great landowners, the two brothers are attested making charitable donations (VI 994, XVI 1945), and performing curial functions (SB XX 14964, possibly 4701). The dossier of Phoebammon and Samuel displays most of the patterns observable in those of the landed aristocrats of late antique Oxyrhynchus, and probably reflects the realities in the lives of the provincial elites of the Empire.

Two further points of interest are the document's consular date, the earliest instance of the first consulship of Fl. Eusebius in a papyrus, and the occurrence of a new toponym, the *ἐποίκιον Cιδαλα*.

The writing is along the fibres. A kollesis runs vertically c.5 cm from the left-hand edge.

ΧΜΥ

[ύπατ]ε[ί]α Φλαουίου Εὐσεβίου τοῦ λαμ[προτάτου, Τύβι [n, ἰνδικτίωνος ιγ.]
 Φλαουίου Φοιβάμ[μωνι καὶ C]αμουηλίω τοῖς λαμ[προτάτοις υἱοῖς τοῦ τῆς]
 περιβλέπτου μνήμης Ἰωάννου γεουχοῦσι ἐντ[αῦθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ καὶ λαμ-]
 5 προτάτῃ Ὁξυρυγχιτῶν πόλει Αὐρήλιοι Ἀπολλ[ῶς υἱὸς 6-8 μητρὸς]
 Ἄννας καὶ Πέκυσις υἱὸς Ἀπίδος μητρὸς Ε.[7-9 ἀμφότεροι ἐν-]
 ἀπόγραφοι γεωργοὶ ἀπὸ ἐποικίου Cιδαλα κ[τήματος τῆς ὑμετέρας]
 μεγαλοπρεπείας τοῦ Ὁξυρυγχιτοῦ νομοῦ. χ[ρείας καὶ νῦν γενομένης]
 εἰς τὴν ὑφ' ἡμᾶς τῆς ὑμῶν μεγαλ[ο]πρε[πείας γεουχικὴν μηχανὴν προσ-]
 10 αγορευομένην Ταπχοχ ἀντλοῦσαν ε[ἰς 10-12 κυλλῆς (?)]
 κυκλάδος μιᾶς καὶ μεγάλου ἐργάτου ἐνὸς καὶ .[18-20
 προσελθόντες ἐξητήσαμεν τὰ εἰρημ[ένα μηχανικὰ ὄργανα (?)]
 παρασχεθῆναι ἡμῖν. αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ τρ[ία μηχανικὰ ὄργανα (?)]
 καινὰ εὐάρεστα ἐπιτήδεια παρασ[χ- 13-15 ἡμῖν]
 15 εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν τῶν μηχανικ[ῶν ὀργάνων 9-11
 ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρῃ ἧ[τ]ι[ε] [ε] [ε] [ε] τὴν Τύβι 10-12

Back, downwards along the fibres:

χειρογραφία Ἀπολλῶ καὶ Πεκύσιος

3 C]αμουηλιω corr. from αμουηλιου 6 υἱος 9 ὑφ ὑμων 14 1. ἐπιτήδεια

‘643. In the consulship of Flavius Eusebius, *vir clarissimus*, Tybi . . . indiction 13.

‘To Flavii Phoebammon and Samuel, *virii clarissimi*, sons of Ioannes of *spectabilis* memory, landowners here in the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites,

Aurelii Apollos son of . . . , mother Anna, and Pecysis son of Apis, mother . . . , both registered farmers from the hamlet of Sidala, a possession of your magnificence in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Since now too a need has arisen for one pot-wheel and one large waterwheel and . . . in the estate irrigator of your magnificence under our charge called Tapchoch, irrigating . . . , we came and asked that the said machine parts be supplied to us. And the said three machine parts, new, satisfactory, serviceable, were provided . . . to us as completion of the machine parts . . . this very day, which is the . . . of Tybi . . .'

Back: 'Cheirograph of Apollos and Pecysis . . .'

² For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 85, 98 (the possible date range is Tybi 1–5; it is less likely, though not inconceivable, that *ὑπατείας* is a mistake for *μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν*, and the text dates from later in Tybi, that is, January 490). For the consulship, see *CLRE* 512–13; cf. 515. This is the earliest instance of Eusebius' first consulate in the papyri; postconsular datings to his first consulate are attested in P. Rain. Cent. 109 and **4698**. The news of his proclamation had not reached Egypt on 20 May 489; cf. P. Flor. III 325 (with BL VII 53), dated by the postconsulate of Longinus. It should be noted that *τὸ β*, which would date the papyrus to the second consulate of Eusebius (493), cannot be read.

³ Φοιβάμ[μωνα καὶ Κα]μουηλίω. See *PLRE* II 883 (Phoebammon 3), 975 (Samuel 2). Phoebammon and Samuel occur together in papyri ranging in date from 27–31 December 489 to 17 November 524: LXVIII **4697** (489), VI **994** (499), LXVIII **4701** (505?), SB XX 14964 (517), XVI **1945** (517), **1946** (524), **2047** (no date). Phoebammon is invariably given precedence, indicative of seniority of age and, later, rank, cf. **4701**. Both are *clarissimi* in 489 (**4697**), but by 499 they carried different dignities: the prescript of **994**, Φοιβά[μμων κόμ(ε)σ] καὶ Καμουηλί περιβλ(επτος), implies that Phoebammon, even if his *comitiva* is not specified, was of higher rank than Samuel, the latter being a *vir spectabilis*. Apparently by that time Phoebammon had been promoted to a higher senatorial grade than his brother. This is confirmed by **4701**, which shows that Phoebammon was a *vir gloriosissimus, comes devotissimorum domesticorum*, and Samuel a *vir spectabilis, comes sacri consistorii*. In later years, the status of the two brothers does not seem to have changed; cf. **1945** 1, which attests the same arrangement as **994**: Φοιβάμμων κόμ(ε)σ καὶ Καμουηλί περιβλ(επτος). That both brothers are collectively called *comites* without further specification in SB 14964.4 *μεγαλοπρε]πεστάτων κομίτων*, and **1946** 1 *κόμ(ε)σ*, need not imply that Samuel received promotion; he was a *comes* by 505(?), even if he is not given this title in **1945**.

It is uncertain whether Phoebammon the son of Ioannes and brother of Samuel is identical with the *comes* Phoebammon in XVI **1888** of 488, even if the text, an order to supply provisions to soldiers, may refer to this same Ioannes. Also, it is unclear whether Fl. Phoebammon, addressed in the 'barely literate' letter LVI **3868** (VI) as Φλαουῖον μεκαλω]πρωπίας καὶ ἐντω]ξωτάτου κυρίου | Φοιβάμμων τῶν | γεχοούτων [*sic*], is the same person; there is at least one other *comes* of this name holding land in the Oxyrhynchite at this same period who cannot be our man, viz. the *spectabilis comes* Fl. Phoebammon alias Lamason in P. Wash. Univ. I 25 (530).

[*υἱός*]. Cf. **4701** 7.

⁴ Ἰωάννου. On this person see **4696** 4 n. The fact that, with the exception of **1888**, the sons always occur together suggests that Ioannes' estate was not divided between them, and continued to be administered as an economic unit after his death. This is the implication of LV **3805** 12 (566) *δ(ιὰ) τῶν κληρ(ονόμων) Ἰωάννου Τιμαγέρον* (if of course the reference is to the father of Phoebammon and Samuel). Curiously, the next entry in this account refers to the *κληρονόμοι τοῦ τῆς ἐνδοξοτάτης μνήμης Φοιβάμμωνος* (l. 13). If this is the son of Ioannes and brother of Samuel, it would follow that Phoebammon had an estate separate from that owned jointly with the other 'heirs of Ioannes son of Timagenes'.

γεουχοῦσι ἐντ[αῦθα κτλ. The expression implies landownership in the area of Oxyrhynchus only; contrast the formulation *γεουχοῦσι καὶ ἐνταῦθα*, on which cf. LXVII **4616** 3–4 n.

6–7 *ἐν]απόγραφοι γεωργοί.* See LXVII **4615** 6 n. (para. 2), **4616** 7–8 n. with references. This is the second earliest text to attest *ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί*, after XXXIV **2724** 6 (469); from the next two decades we have XLIX **3512** 8 (492), XVI **1982** 7 (497), and LXVII **4615** 6 (505). The term has been restored in P. Mil. II 64.4–5 (440, cf.

4687 2 n.) [Ἀύρηλιος Παῦλος υἱὸς Ἀ]πφοῦτος ἀπὸ ἐποικίῳ[v] K[α]λπονίου τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ τῆς αὐτῆς θειοτάτης οἰκίας γεωργός | [ἐναπόγραφος]. The supplement has generally been accepted; cf. e.g. I. F. Fikhman in *Miscellanea Borgia* ii = Pap. Flor. XIX (1990) 167 n. 38, or J. Banaji, *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity* (2001) 130. But there are several difficulties. (i) The supplement would produce the earliest instance of an ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός (it first occurs in a law of 458), cf. J.-M. Carrié, *Pap. Congr. XVII* iii (1984) 942 with n. 21. (ii) The restored word order is unparallelled; see J. G. Keenan, *ZPE* 17 (1975) 250 n. 29. (iii) No other example of an ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός of the *domus divina* has appeared in a papyrus. Thus it seems preferable to leave the lacuna of P. Mil. 64.5 without a supplement.

7 *Κιδαλα*. This locality appears to be new. (It is possible that the putative κ of κ[τήματος is part of the toponym.) It may be asked, however, whether this is the same as the ἐποίκιον Καδάλου, on which see Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchie* 160.

8 *μεγαλοπρεπείας*. Cf. 9. In 3, Phoebammon and Samuel are styled *λαμπρότατοι*. The abstract was used with holders of all three senatorial grades; cf. R. Delmaire, *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 158–9.

χ[ρείας. Possibly also χ[αίρειν]. χρείας (but χ[αίρειν. χρείας would be too long).

9 *εἰς τὴν ὑφ' ἡμᾶς τῆς ὑμῶν μεγαλ[ο]πρε[πείας γεουχικὴν μηχανήν*. For the formula cf. XVI **1982** 9–10, on which the restorations are based; but the line as restored seems rather long. *γεουχικὴν*, which occurs in all other documents of this kind (save for those addressed to functionaries of the *domus divina*), is not strictly necessary (the possessors of the *μηχανή* are sufficiently indicated by *τῆς ὑμῶν μεγαλ[ο]πρε[πείας]*, but without it the line would be rather short.

9–10 *προσ[αγορευομένην*. The usual expression is *καλουμένην*; the only parallels I have found come from much earlier texts; cf. P. Stras. II 81.2.23 (115 BC) and P. Köln I 50.2.24 (99 BC) *χῶμα προσαγορευόμενον Τοῶμε*, BGV IV 1120.7 (5 BC) *ἐν τῷ προσαγορευομένῳ Φοινικῶν*, I **34** = M. Chr. 188.1.13 (127) [*τῶν πρ[ο]σαγορευομένων [συνοκλ]ηζέμων*]; the participle also in SB VI 9464.6 (VII), but the context is fragmentary.

10 *Ταπχοχ*. This *μηχανή* is new.

εἰς ἄμπελον καὶ εἰς ἀρόριον γῆν, cf. e.g. P. Mil. 64.6, would fit the space, but there must be other possibilities too.

10–11 *κυλλῆς (?) κυκλάδος*. *κυλλῆς* is likely but not inevitable (not in XVI **1899** 10–11). On this term, of uncertain meaning, see J. P. Oleson, *Greek and Roman Mechanical Water-lifting Devices: The History of a Technology* (1984) 133–4, 152–3; D. Bonneau, *Le Régime administratif de l'eau du Nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine* (1993) 112–13.

11 *μεγάλου ἐργάτου*. See Bonneau, op. cit. 111; for examples see *Tyche* 12 (1997) 253 (Korr. *Tyche* 241); add SB XX 15097.6.

It is not clear what to restore in the break. I have thought of *μ[ικροῦ ἐργάτου ἐνός*, cf. P. Lond. III 776.9 (p. 258), but I would expect the foot of the leg of *μ* to be visible.

12 *προσελθόντες ἐξητήσαμεν*. Cf. P. Mil. 64.6–7 *προσελθὼν εἰ[π]ι | [τῆς πόλεως ἡξί]ωσα*. All other texts of this type have a version of *ἀνελθὼν/-όντες ἐπὶ τῆς/-ῆν πόλεως/-ιν ἡξίωσα/-μεν*.

14 *παρασχ-*. I do not see how to restore this line convincingly. It is possible that we have a genitive absolute, cf. P. Mil. 64.7–8 *κ[αὶ] τῆς σῆς ἀρετῆς εὐθέως | [--- τὸν αὐτὸν ἐργάτην καινὸν] ἐπιτήδιον . . . παρασχομένης*, in which case we may consider restoring *τὰ πρ[ο]α ὄργανα τῆς ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρεπείας* . . . *παρασχομένης ἡμῖν*, or *τὰ πρ[ο]α μηχανικὰ ὄργανα* . . . *παρασχομένης ἡμῖν τῆς ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρεπείας*. But *μεγαλοπρεπείας*, even abbreviated, is implausibly long; either a different abstract was used, or the postulated constructions are wrong. I have also considered reading *τὰ πρ[ο]α μηχανικὰ ὄργανα* . . . *παρασ[χθέντα ἡμῖν ὑπὸ τῆς ὑμῶν abstract*, but in this case too space would be a problem.

15 *μηχανικ[ῶν ὀργάνων*. Though the text could well run *μηχανικ[ῶν ὀργάνων] | ἐν τῇ σῆμερον κτλ.*, some ten further letters must have come after *ὀργάνων* in the lacuna. *ὑπεδεξάμεθα* would fit, but its presumed place in the construction cannot be paralleled from elsewhere. *ἄτῶνα ὑποδεξάμενοι*, which could be paralleled by XVI **1899** 16, **1982** 17, or XXXIV **2724** 15, would be too long for the space.

17 *Ἀπολλῶ*. For this genitive of *Ἀπολλῶς*, common in later periods, see Gignac, *Grammar* ii 61.

4698. TOP OF CONTRACT

106/90(b)

13 × 7.8 cm

3 October 490

This fragment, the top of a contract of some sort, is of interest for its post-consular dating clause: it shows that some nine months after the proclamation of Flavius Longinus, the consul of 490, the name of the consul of the previous year, Flavius Eusebius, was still in use at Oxyrhynchus.

[ΧΜ]Υ
 † μετὰ τῆ[ν ὑπατείαν Φ]λαουῖου
 Εὐσε[βί]ου τοῦ λαμπρ[ο(τάτου)], Φαῶφι ̅,
 ἰδὲ ἰνδικ(τίωνος).
 5 Αὐρηλία Ἄννα θυγάτηρ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τῆ[ς]
 Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλεως Αὐρηλίῳ
 [.] ἡ υἱῶ [̅5]ου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆ[ς]

Back, downwards along the fibres:

ὁμολ[ογία

2 φλαουῖου 4 ἰνδικς 5 ἰωσήφ

‘643. After the consulship of Flavius Eusebius, *vir clarissimus*, Phaophi 6, indiction 14. ‘Aurelia Anna, daughter of Joseph, from the city of the Oxyrhynchites, to Aurelius . . . son of . . . from the same (city) . . .’

Back: ‘Agreement . . .’

2–4 For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 85, 96. This is the latest postconsular dating to Fl. Eusebius cos. 489 (the indiction figure shows that the reference is to his first consulate), on whom see **4697** 2 n. The earliest Egyptian dating by Fl. Longinus II cos. 490 is 16 December 490 (P. Rain. Cent. 110).

7 τῆς αὐτῆ[ς]. πόλεως would have followed in l. 8, now lost.

N. GONIS

4699. ORDER TO SUPPLY WINE

68 6B.21/H(1–2)a

20 × 4 cm

23 January 504

An order from a *comes* called Ioannes to Phoebammon, wine-steward, to supply wine to a servant or slave; cf. **I 141** = SPP VIII 1155 (19.xii.503), and PSI VIII 957 (29.i.504, cf. BL XI 248).

The writing is across the fibres of the recto of the original roll; a kollesis runs horizontally 1.1–1.8 cm from the upper edge. The back is blank.

✠ Ἰωάννης κόμης Φοιβάμμωνι ρ[ἰνοχειρ(ιστή)]·
 παράσχ(ου) Θεοδώρω παιδ(ί) τοῦ κυρίου(υ) Ἀθανασίου(υ) λόγ(ω) διατροφ(ών) τῶν ἀπὸ μην(ός) Τ[ύβι] --- οἴνου
 (ἔτους) ρπ ρμθ, Τύβι κζ, [ἰ]νδ(ικτίωνος) ιβ// διπλοῦν ἔν, γί(νεται) οἴν(ου) δι(πλοῦν) α μό(νον).
 (s cont., m. 2) ✠ σεσημει(ωμαι) οἴνου δι[πλοῦν ἔν, γί(νεται) οἴν(ου) δι(πλοῦν) α.
 μηνί Τύβι κζ, ιβ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος). ✠

2 παρασχ(ου) παιδ(ί) κυρίου(υ) αθανασίου(υ) λογ(ω) διατροφ(ών) μην(ός) 3, 4 ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) 3 L γε(νησ) 4 μ(ηνος)
 (m. 2) σεσημει(ωμαι)

Ἰωάννης, *comes*, to Phoebammon, wine-steward. Deliver to Theodorus, servant of the lord Athanasius, on account of victuals from the month of Tybi . . . one double jar of wine, total 1 double jar of wine only. Year 180/149, Tybi 27, indiction 12.’ (2nd hand) ‘I have countersigned one double jar of wine, total 1 double-jar of wine, in the month of Tybi 27, of the 12th indiction.’

1 Ἰωάννης κόμης. On this person, see **4696** 4 n. para. 4. By comparison with **4699** and **I 141**, it is probable that Ἰωάννης κόμης is to be restored in the break to the left of l. 1 of PSI VIII 957.

Φοιβάμμωνι ρ[ἰνοχειρ(ιστή)]. Cf. **141** 1, PSI 957.1.

2 παιδ(ί) or παιδ(αρίω). On the term, see **4683** 2 n.

λόγ(ω) διατροφ(ών). Cf. P. Cair. Masp. I 67006v:36 (522?). διατροφ(ής) is another possibility. An equivalent expression is ὑπὲρ τροφῆς, which recurs in the archive of the ἐλαιουργός Sambas; see F. Mitthof, A. Papatomas, *ZPE* 103 (1994) 61–2.

τῶν ἀπὸ μην(ός) Τ[ύβι]. What is lost in the break is the reference to the period for which the victuals were required. After the (putative) month name, one expects εἰς followed by another chronological indication; cf. **XVI 1920** 13 (after 11.ii.563, cf. BL X 145), LV **3804** 231, 256 (566), VII **1043** 2 (578), XVIII **2196** r 11 (587?), etc.

3 The layout of the line is curious, but probably is only due to shortage of writing space. After the date, we have what must be the continuation of the text from line 2. (The placement of the year symbol in the papyrus rules out the possibility that the chronological indications in l. 4 belong with the body of the text.)

For the conversion of the date see *CSBE* 85, 98.

3–4 The same countersignature and in the same hand also in **141** 6 and PSI 957.6–7; see T. M. Hickey, *ZPE* 123 (1998) 161 (= BL XI 143, 249). Those two texts have εἰς Φοιβάμμ(ωνα) οἴνοχειρ(ιστήν) after the reference to the quantity of wine and before the date; but spacing does not seem to allow restoring this expression here. The countersignature in P. Harr. I 91.3 (484), which may stem from the same Ioannes, looks different, but one has to bear in mind that twenty years separate the two texts.

N. GONIS

4700. TOP OF CONTRACT

4 B.75/E(1–2)a

12.3 × 7.6 cm

18 November 504

The main interest of this document, shown by the docket to be a contract, lies in the attestation of a military unit not otherwise recorded as a *numerus*, the ἀριθμὸς τῶν γενναϊοτάτων καὶ καθωσιωμένων Φαρανιτῶν; see further 3–5 n.

ⲫ ὑπατία Φλαουῖου Κεθῆγου τοῦ ἐνδοξ(οτάτου),
 Ἄθῦρ κβ, ἰνδικ(τίωνος) γγ.
 Φλαουῖω Σερήνω στρατιώτης ἀριθ(μοῦ)
 τῶν γεννεωτάτων καὶ καθοσιωμέ-
 5 νων Φαρανιτῶν υἱῶ Ἀντιόχου ἀπὸ τῆς
 λαμπρᾶς Ὀξυρρυχιτῶν πόλεως Αὐρή-
 λιος Φιλέας υἱὸς Γερμανοῦ μητρὸς Ἡρα-
 εἶ[δ]ο[ς c.4] . . . [c.8] . [c.4] .

Back, downwards along the fibres:

ⲫ γραμ(μάτιον) χ . . [

1 ὑπατία, 1. ὑπατεία	φλαουῖου	ἐνδοξ	2 ἰνδικ	3 φλαουῖω	1. στρατιώτη	ἀριθ(
4 1. γενναιοτάτων	4-5 1. καθοσιωμένων		5 νων: second v ex. corr.	ῦω		7 υἱος
7-8 1. Ἡραῖδος	9 γραμ					

‘In the consulship of Flavius Cethegus, *vir gloriosissimus*, Hathyr 22, indiction 13.

‘To Flavius Serenus, soldier of the *numerus* of the *fortissimi* and *devotissimi* Pharanites, son of Antiochus, from the splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelius Phileas, son of Germanus, mother Herais . . .’

Back: ‘Contract . . .’

1 For the consulship, see *CLRE* 542–3; cf. 544–5.

ἐνδοξ(οτάτου). This is the epithet of Fl. Cethegus in all texts from Oxyrhynchus dated by his consulate (besides this one, in XVI 1883 and 1966); in documents from other parts of Egypt he is invariably called λαμπροτάτος. Cf. 4701 1 n.

1–2 For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 85, 97.

3–5 ἀριθ(μοῦ) . . . Φαρανιτῶν. Φαρανίται have occurred in P. Cair. Masp. I 67054.2, 4 (VI), P. Flor. III 297.192, 219, 303 (540/1?), P. Lond. V 1735.24 (VI), SB XIV 11854.7, 8 (V/VI). The term was rightly interpreted to be a colloquial reference to the soldiers of a military unit associated with Pharan, a locality in the Sinai; see J. Gascou, *BIEAO* 76 (1976) 169–75, and A. K. Bowman, J. D. Thomas, *BjRL* 61 (1978–79) 312. There is no mention of this *numerus* in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, which suggests that its formation postdates the composition of the *Notitia*, placed in 401 by C. Zuckerman, *AnTard* 6 (1998) 144–7.

It should be noted that no Φαρανίται occur in P. Wash. Univ. II 105.2. The view entertained by the editor in the commentary (p. 202) that the mysterious παρ() φαρρ() may conceal a reference to this unit should be abandoned; the plate (XXVII b) allows reading παιδαρρ, i. e. παιδαρ(ίος).

The *numeri* initially were ethnic auxiliary forces; see D. Hoffmann, *Das spätromische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum* i (1969) 171–2, ii (1970) 61 n. 402, P. Southern, *Britannia* 20 (1989) 83–4; cf. M. P. Speidel, *ANRW* II.3 202–31 = id., *Roman Army Studies* i (1984) 117–48. But at this time the term referred to all kinds of military units; cf. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* ii (1964) 655. The fact that Serenus was a native of Oxyrhynchus is symptomatic of the character of the *militia* of the period.

6 λαμπρᾶς Ὀξυρρυχιτῶν πόλεως. Early sixth-century texts increasingly refer to Oxyrhynchus as λαμπρά only, whereas previously the city was called almost uniformly λαμπρὰ καὶ λαμπροτάτη; see D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 12 (1973) 286, 290.

9 γραμ(μάτιον) χ. . [. After χ, α or ο, followed by what might be read as ρ. This can hardly be the start of a personal name, since it cannot be reconciled with either of the contracting parties (unless a third party was mentioned in the part now lost). SB XVIII 13768.10–11 (IV) γραμμάτιον χάριτος is not paralleled otherwise, and this does not encourage me to read χάρ[ιτος here.

N. GONIS

4701. TOP OF DOCUMENT

97/221(c)

11.2 × 6.8 cm

505²

Assuming that the restorations proposed are correct, this text is of interest for attesting the full titulare of the brothers Phoebammon and Samuel in the early sixth century: the former was a *comes domesticorum*, the latter a *comes sacri consistorii*.

The nature of the document is unclear; that it addresses the two brothers as *curiales* may offer an indication that it related to their curial duties. There is a possibility that the two brothers were further addressed as *riparii*, see 7 n., in which case this would be a petition.

A scrap has not been placed. The back is blank so far as it is preserved. A kollesis runs vertically 0.6 cm from the right-hand edge.

[† ὑπατείας Φλαουῶν Καβι]γμανοῦ καὶ Θεοδώ[ρου] τῶν λαμπροτάτων,
 [month day indiction] ἐν Ὁξυρύγχ(ων).
 [Φλαουῖοις Φοι]βάμ[μω]νι τῷ μεγαλοπρε[πεσ]τάτῳ καὶ ἐνδο-
 [ξοτάτῳ κόμμετι τῷ]ν καθοσιωμένων δομεστικῶν καὶ
 5 [Cαμουηλίῳ τῷ μ]εγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ καὶ περιβλέπ[τ]ῳ κόμμετι
 [τοῦ θεοῦ κονσιστ]ωρίου ἀμφοτέροις ἀιδεσ[ί]μοις πολιτενομένοι[ς]
 [. υἱ]οῖς το[ῦ] τῆς περιβλέπτου [μν]ήμης Ἰωάννου

]τα . [
] ιοςπ[
 10]ς ὑμῶν [

2 οξυρυγχ

4 ι. καθοσιωμένων

7 ἰωαννου

10 ὑμων

‘In the consulship of Flavii Sabinianus and Theodorus, *viri clarissimi*, . . . in Oxyrhynchus.

‘To Flavii Phoebammon, *magnificentissimus et gloriosissimus comes devotissimorum domesticorum*, and Samuel, *magnificentissimus et spectabilis comes sacri consistorii*, both respected *curiales* . . . sons of Ioannes of *spectabilis* memory . . .’

1 *ὑπατείας*. It seems less likely that a postconsular formula (*μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν*) is to be restored, even with *Φλαουτών* abbreviated, since this would be rather long for the space.

For the consulship, see *CLRE* 544–5, cf. 506, and P. Heid. V 357 introd. **4701** cannot be earlier than mid July 505; on 16 July 505, P. Flor. I 73 = P. Stras. V 471bis was dated to the postconsulate of Fl. Cethegus cos. 504, while one day later Fl. Sabinianus and Theodorus make their first appearance (XVI **1994**; the alternative dating to 14 July, cf. BL VII 143, involves an emendation and is less likely).

λαμπροτάτων. In the two other Oxyrhynchus papyri dated to their consulate, Sabinianus and Theodorus are styled *ἐνδοξότατοι* (XVI **1994**, LXVII **4615**), but they are invariably called *λαμπρότατοι* in the Thebaid. (I intend to discuss the issue of regionalism in consular epithets elsewhere.)

2 *ἐν Ὀξυρύγχ(ων)*, *scil. πόλει*. For the expansion, see D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 12 (1973) 291; cf. **4688** 3, **4696** 3. (In P. Leid. Inst. 70.2 (518), P. Berol. 21753.2 [ed. *APP* 42 (1996) 81] (540), and XXXVI **2780** 5 (553), in place of *ἐν Ὀξυρρυγχ(ιτών)* read *ἐν Ὀξυρύγχ(ων)*.)

4 *κόμετι τῶν καθοσιωμένων* (l. *καθω-*) *δομestikῶν*. On the title, see LXVII **4615** 3–4 n., and I.-M. Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser, *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter in den griechischsprachigen dokumentarischen Texten Ägyptens* ii (2000) 250–2.

Phoebammon was a *vir clarissimus* in 489 (**4697**), but a *vir illustris* around 505 (**4701**), perhaps already in 499; cf. **4697** 3 n. A parallel to the rise of a scion of an aristocratic Egyptian family from the first to the third senatorial grade through the *comitiva domesticorum* is furnished by the case of Fl. Strategius, father of Fl. Apion cos. 539, on whom see LXVII **4614** 1 n., **4615** 3–4 n.

5 [*Caμουηλίω*]. The name is restored on the basis of the occurrence of Phoebammon in 3 and the indication of the filiation in 7.

5–6 *κόμετι [τοῦ θείου κονιστ]ωρίου*. See **4696** 4 n. para. 8.

6 *αἰδέε[?]μοις πολιτενομένοι[ς]*. The use of the epithet *αἰδέεμος*, characteristic of curial rank, is noteworthy; cf. CPR IX 36.3–4 (487/8) *τῶ λα]μπροτάτω καὶ αἰδέεμῳ πολι[τενομένῳ]*.

7 At the start of the line [*καὶ ῥιπαρίοις υἱ]οῖς* would fit exactly; petitions addressed to (*αἰδέεμοι*) *πολιτενομένοι καὶ ῥιπαρίοι* include P. Mil. II 45 (449), P. Gron. Amst. 1 = SB XXIV 15970 (455), SB XVIII 13596 (464), LXVII **4614** (late V).

υἱ]οῖς το[ῦ] τῆς περιβλέπτου [μν]ήμητος Ἰωάννου. Cf. **4697** 3–4.

9 *υἱός* possible.

N. GONIS

4702. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF LOAN

12 1B.144/H(d)a

16 × 9.5 cm

5 February 520

The upper part of a loan, cf. 8–9 n.; the creditor is a priest. It is of interest for attesting the latest Egyptian dating by the postconsulate of Fl. Iustinus Aug. cos. 519, and possibly a new locality, the *ἐποίκιον Νεοφύτου Ἀντιόχου*.

On the back there are traces of an endorsement, mostly abraded (erased deliberately?), and the beginnings of seven lines of shorthand.

μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Φλ(αουίου) Ἰουστίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου

Αὐγούστου, Μεχεῖρ ι, ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ιγ, ἐν Ὀξυρύγχ(ων).

[τ]ῶ εὐλαβεστάτῳ Φοιβάμμωνι πρεσβυτέρῳ τῆς ἀγίας

ἐκκλησίας υἱῶ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου ἀπὸ τῆς Ὀξυρρυγχιτών

5 Ἀὐρήλιοι Φιλόξενος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀμφότεροι ὁμογενῆσιοι
 ἀδελφοὶ ἐκ πατρὸς Ὀγνώφριου μητρὸς Σοφίας ὀρμώμενοι
 ἀπὸ ἐποικίου Νεοφύτου Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Ὀξυρνηχίτου νομοῦ χαίρειν.
 κ[υ]ρίων ὄντων καὶ βεβαίων τῶν προτέρων ἡμῶν
 [γ]ραμματίων, ὄντων παρὰ τῆς ζητῆ εὐλαβείας, τῆς πίστεως
 10 αὐτῶν ἀκολούθως ὁ[μολο]γοῦ[μ]ε[ν] ε[] . . [c.6] . . . [] . . .
 [. . .] . . [] . [

1 I. ὑπατεῖαν φλς 2 ωα οξυρνηχς

After the consulship of our master Flavius Iustinus, the eternal Augustus, Mecheir 10, indiction 13, at Oxyrhynchus.

‘To the most pious Phoebammon, priest of the holy church, son of the blessed Ioannes, from the (city) of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelii Philoxenus and Ioannes, both full brothers, (their) father (being) Onnophris, mother Sophia, originating from the hamlet of Neophytou Antiochou of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greetings. Our earlier contracts, kept by your piety, remaining authoritative and secure, according to their integrity, we acknowledge that . . .’

1 On the consulship, see *CLRE* 572–3. Its only other secure attestation in a papyrus is in LVII **3914** 1–2 (14 July 519), which adds τὸ α’ after *Ἀγούστου*. It has been restored in P. Stras. III 133.1, see BL V 131, but this is very uncertain (what remains on the papyrus could also be part of a regnal date clause). The earliest Egyptian dating by Fl. Vitalianus cos. 520 occurs in P. Lond. V 1699.1, dated 11 August 520.

2 ἐν Ὀξυρνήχ(ων). Cf. **4701** 2 n.

3 πρεσβυτέρω. For clergymen featuring in loans see G. Schmelz, *Kirchliche Amtsträger im spätantiken Ägypten* (2002) 247–9.

3–4 τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας. This is probably the ‘cathedral’ of Oxyrhynchus. The absence of a further indication may make the reference ambiguous, cf. L. Antonini, *Aegyptus* 20 (1940) 172, but in XVI **2020** and **2040**, two lists of payments by leading Oxyrhynchite landowners of the second half of the sixth century, the entries διὰ τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας (**2020** 16, **2040** 7) no doubt refer to the episcopal church of Oxyrhynchus.

7–8 ἐποικίου Νεοφύτου Ἀντιόχου. It is unclear whether this locality is to be identified with that recorded in Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell’Ossirinchi* 116, variously described as ἐποίκιον, κτήμα, or χωρίον. The added element Ἀντιόχου may help distinguish this locality from Νεοφύτου Βάνου, attested in P. Select. 20 (592, cf. BL X 113). The ἐποίκιον Νεοφύτου in LVII **3914** 5–6 (519) could be either of the two.

8–9 κ[υ]ρίων ὄντων καὶ βεβαίων τῶν προτέρων ἡμῶν [γ]ραμματίων. The formulation is common, cf. CPR VII 40.5 n., and indicates that another loan had previously been made but had not been repaid.

9–10 τῆς πίστεως αὐτῶν ἀκολούθως. The formulation also occurs in XXXIV **2718** 9 (458), on which the editor noted: ‘According to W. Schmitz, ἡ πίστις in *den Papyri* (diss. Köln, 1964), p. 111, this expression is part of the bombastic Byzantine style and has no precise legal force’. Cf. also SB XX 15134.6 (483) and SB I 5315.5 (‘Byz.’).

10 After ὁ[μολο]γοῦ[μ]ε[ν] we expect ἐξ ἀλληλεγγύης or ἐσχηκέναι, but neither can be confirmed on the traces.

4703. DEED OF SURETY

97/104(a)

13.6 × 8.9 cm

22 May 622
Plate XVI

The publication of LVIII **3959** (620) and **3960** (621) has shown that the Oxyrhynchite estate of Flavius Apion III continued to function as an economic unit under the Persians and after his death (see **3959** introd.). **4703** and very probably **4704** (626) further testify to the survival of the estate well into the period of the Persian occupation of Egypt (619–29). **4703** is also the latest papyrus from Oxyrhynchus to contain an explicit reference to the household of Apion III (though cf. LVIII **3962**).

On Egypt under Persian rule, see most recently R. Altheim-Stiehl, *Tyche* 6 (1991) 3–16, and ead. in O. Brehm, S. Klie (eds.), *ΜΟΥΣΙΚΟΣ ANHP: Festschrift für Max Wegner* (1992) 5–8.

† ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου
 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτήρος
 ἡμῶν. μηνὶ Παχώ[ν] κζ, ἰνδ[(ικτίωνος)] ι.
 τῷ ἐνδόξῳ οἴκῳ ποτὲ Ἀπίωνος τοῦ
 5 ἐν εὐκλεεῖ τῇ μνήμῃ τῷ διακειμέ(νω)
 καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ὀξ(υρνηχιδῶν) πόλ(ιν) Αὐρήλιος Ἀνοῦπ
 [υἱὸς τοῦ μα]κ[αρί]ου Παύλου ἐξῆς ὑπογράφων

Back, downwards along the fibres:

† ἐγγ(ύη) Ἀν[οῦπ

2 ἱησου 3 ἰνδ ἰ 5 διακειμέ; κ corr. from μ 6 οξ ποχ 7 ὑπογραφων 8 εγγ

‘In the name of the Lord and Master Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour. In the month of Pachon 27, indiction 10.

‘To the glorious household sometime belonging to Apion in well-famed memory, situated also at the city of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelius Anup son of the blessed Paul signing below . . .’

Back: ‘Guarantee of Anup . . .’

1–3 On the invocation of Christ (type 1), see R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *CE* 56 (1981) 121.

3 That this indiction 10 corresponds to 621/2 is shown by the absence of a regnal dating clause, as well as by comparison with LVIII **3960** of 621, likewise addressed ‘to the glorious household sometime belonging to Apion in well-famed memory’.

4–6 The same formulation in **3960** 1–2; cf. also **3959** 4–5.

4 τῷ ἐνδόξῳ οἴκῳ. It is conceivable that Apion’s household is referred to in the Oxyrhynchite P. Mich. XV

743.5–6 νοταρ(ίω) | τοῦ ἐνδόξ(ου) οἴκου; the text, headed by the Christ invocation and lacking a regnal formula, is dated Choiak 1[], ind. 11, which may correspond to 6–15 December 622.

5–6 τῶ διακεμέ(νω) καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ὀξ(υρνηχιδῶν) πόλ(ιν). This recalls the expression γεουχοῦντι καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῆ . . . Ὀξ. πόλει, found in documents addressed to members of the Apion family from 523 (XVI 1984) to 619 (P. Iand. III 49).

N. GONIS

4704. RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT TO *POTAMITAE*

6 IB.15/B(f)

32 × 7.1 cm

29 August–27 September 626
Plate VIII

This receipt, the latest of the very few Oxyrhynchite texts from the time of Persian rule, may offer additional evidence for the survival of the household of Apion III under the Persians. The ἐποίκιον Παρθηνιάδος, whose προνοητής figures in the receipt, is known to have been among the Apion holdings as late as 621 (LVIII 3960 34); earlier texts also place it under a προνοητής (see further 2 n. para. 2). The structure of a large estate employing local managers was evidently in place in 626; it is a natural assumption that the estate was what used to be the ἔνδοξος οἶκος of the Apions.

The receipt certifies a payment by the προνοητής to two ποταμίται, workers involved in the maintenance of the irrigation system, on account of their monthly salaries for work at some new plantings, probably vineyards. The salaries of these workers have lately been discussed by F. Morelli in *Pap. Congr. XXI* ii (1997) 727–37. It is of some interest that this is the first text recording a salary payment to ποταμίται made entirely in kind (wheat).

The hand is of the type of P. Amh. II 157 (612), illustrated in G. Cavallo, H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period* (1987) no. 43a, discussed *ibid.*, p. 94. This style of writing, common in orders to pay and receipts from late sixth- and early seventh-century Oxyrhynchus, is the precursor of the documentary minuscule used by official chanceries in early Islamic Egypt. The abbreviations employed here also look forward to the abbreviation system current in the later period (briefly described by H. I. Bell, *P. Lond.* IV pp. xliiv–v).

The writing runs across the fibres; no sheet-join is visible. The left and right edges are virtually intact, so that the width of the piece (32 cm) should represent the original height of the roll from which the strip was cut.

- 1 †
- 2 † ἐδόθ(ησαν) δι(ὰ) Cεργίου προ(νοητοῦ) Παρθηνιάδος † Ἰακῶβ (καὶ) Φοιβά(μμωνι)
ποταμ(ίταις) ἐργαζομ(ένοις) εἰ(ς) τ(ὰ) νεόφυτα
- 3 χωρ(ία) Ἐξω τῆς Πύλης λόγω μισθ(οῦ) ἐπὶ μῆ(νός) Θῶθ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἰε ἀπὸ παλαι(οῦ)
γενήμ(ατος) κύτου καγκ(έλλω) ἀρτ(άβαι) δεκαέξ,
- 4 γί(νονται) κύτ(ου) καγκ(έλλω) (ἀρτάβαι) ἰς μ(όνας).
- 5 (ἔτους) τγ (καὶ) σοβ μῆ(νός) Θῶθ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἰε.

Back, along the fibres:

† πι(ττάκιον) τῶν ποταμιτ(ῶν) (vac.) ιε ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) κί(του) (ἀρτάβαι) ις.
 2 εδδδλκ προ ς φοιβῆ ποταμίμ εργαζομίμ ετ̄ 3 χωρ μιῆ μ̄ νδκ παλαι γενημς καγ* αῖ
 4 † κε κατ μκ 5 † ς μῆ ε 6 πε ποταμιτ' νδκ κε τ

‘There was given through Sergius, *pronoetes* of Partheniados, to Iacob and Phoebammon, *potamitae*, working at the new plantations of ‘Outside the Gate’, on account of (their) salary for the month of Thoth of the 15th indiction, from old produce sixteen artabas of wheat by the cancellus (measure), total: 16 artabas of wheat by the cancellus (measure) only.

‘Year 303 and 272, month Thoth, indiction 15.’

Back: ‘Voucher of the *potamitae*, indiction 15, 16 artabas of wheat.’

2 *Cerylion* and *Partheniados* are written in a different (brownish as opposed to black ink) by the same hand; evidently they are later additions. Dr Coles wonders whether the cross after *Partheniados* serves like the Xs in orders to arrest, to preclude any additions.

προ(νοητοῦ). On the functions of *προνοηταί*, see LV **3804** introd.; R. Mazza, *ZPE* 122 (1998) 161ff.

Παρθενιάδος. See P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchi* (1981) 136; LV **3805** 102 (566) and LVIII **3960** 34 (621) are additional attestations of this hamlet. Most of the references stem from documents related to the Apion estate; *προνοηταί* occur in XVI **1916** 5, 20, 31 (VI), **2031** 16 (VI/VII).

ποταμι(ίταις). See Morelli, loc. cit. (with references to earlier literature).

2–3 *εἰς τ(ᾶ) νεόφυτα χωρ(ία)*. The expression also occurs in XVI **1912** 152 and XIX **2244** 82, 85, 87. *νεόφυτον* usually refers to a newly planted vineyard, see M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten* (1925) 245, although the word may be used for other plantings too; cf. P. Köln V p. 167. Insofar as in this period the term *χωρίον* applies predominantly to vineyards, see R. S. Bagnall, *CE* 74 (1999) 329–33, it seems virtually certain that these *νεόφυτα χωρ(ία)* were newly planted vineyards.

3 *Ἐξω τῆς Πύλης*. This was a *προάστειον*, a palatial residence of the Apions just outside one of the city gates of Oxyrhynchus; see LI **3640** 2 n. para. 2., LV **3804** 268–9 n. The area had vineyards, orchards, and gardens, all of which would require plenty of irrigation, and naturally canal workers.

κίτου καγκ(έλλω) ἀρτ(άβαι) δεκαέξ. At that date 1 solidus could buy 8–12 artabas of wheat, so that the salary of each of these *ποταμίται* would be equivalent to $\frac{2}{3}$ –1 sol. per month, which is well paralleled; see Morelli, loc. cit. 733–6.

παλαι(οῦ) γενήμ(ατος). The collocation only in P. Amh. II 79.13–14 (c.186) (*παλαιῶν γενημ[ά]των*), and VII **1071** 3 (V). The reference, I suppose, is to wheat that comes from the harvest of previous years.

5 For the conversion of the date, see *CSBE* 93, 96.

N. GONIS

INDEXES

Figures in small raised type refer to fragments, small roman numerals to columns. Square brackets indicate that a word is wholly or substantially restored by conjecture or from other sources, round brackets that it is expanded from an abbreviation or a symbol. An asterisk denotes a word not recorded in *LSJ* or its *Revised Supplement*. The article, *καί* (in the documentary section only) and quotations and lemmata from known authors are not indexed (see Index of Citations of Known Authors).

I. TRAGEDY AND COMEDY

a. 4639, 4641–6

- ἄβουλ- [4639¹ ii 12?]
 ἀγαθός (κρείττων) 4639² 2
 ἀγαπᾶν 4646¹ 11
 ἄγειν 4639¹ ii 14
 ἄγρυν- 4646¹ 15
 ἀδελφή 4645 ii 7
 ἀηδής 4646¹ 5
 ἄθλιος 4641 14
 ἄθρός 4645 i 4
 αἰρεῖσθαι 4643 9
 αἰτία 4642 8
 ἀκούειν 4642 15
 ἀληθής 4642 3
 ἀλίσκεσθαι 4643 13?
 ἀλλά 4639¹ ii 8 4643 5? 4645 ii 7?
 ἄλλος 4645 ii 3 [4646¹ 12]
 ἄν 4642 3 4645 ii 10, 11
 ἄνθρωπος 4644 5
 ἄπας [4642 3]
 ἀπιέναι 4645 ii 11
 ἀργός 4641 13
 ἄροτος [4646¹ 6]
 ἄροτρον 4639¹ ii 7
 ἄσωτος 4641 7
 Ἀττική 4644 3
 ἀσος 4645 ii 6
 αὐτός 4639¹ ii 1 4641 9, [15] 4642 4, [11] 4646¹ 3

 βίος 4645 i 3
 βοή 4645 ii 9
 βούλεσθαι [4639¹ ii 12?] 4641 15
 βράμα 4643 5?

 γάρ 4639¹ ii 18 4641 11, 12, 18 4642 13
 γε 4641 6, 14? 4642 3, 7 4643 12 4645 ii 12
 γέρων 4643 19
 γῆ 4639¹ ii 5
 γίνεσθαι 4642 12 4645 ii 7 4646¹ 16
 γλαφυρός [4642 1]
 γύης 4639¹ ii 7
 γυμνάζειν 4645 ii 4

 δέ 4639¹ ii 1 4641 9?, 13, 21
 δεῖν 4641 6 4645 i 4, ii 9
 δέιλη 4641 16
 δεινός 4646¹ 1
 δεσπότης 4639² 7 4641 20
 δῆ 4641 2 4643 12
 διά 4646¹ 3
 διαφέρειν [4642 10?]
 διδάσκαλος [4642 2]
 δίδοναι 4646¹ 7
 δίκαιος 4641 19
 διπλάσιος 4641 14
 δοκεῖν 4639¹ ii 16

 εἶν 4639¹ ii 1, 2
 ἐγώ 4639¹ ii 14 4642 1 4645 ii 4, [8?] 4646¹ 10
 ἔθος 4646¹ 4
 εἶ 4639¹ ii 3, 18 4641 6
 εἶα 4639¹ ii 14
 εἶναι 4641 7, 12, 14, 18 4642 1, 8 4645 i 9, ii 3 (*bis*),
 8, 10
 εἴπερ 4644 8
 εἰς, ἐς 4639¹ ii 8 4642 9 4645 ii 5

εἶς **4641** 18
 ἔκαστος **4641** 18
 ἔλεινός **4645** ii 6
 Ἑλλάς **4645** i 1
 ἐλπίζειν **4642** 3
 ἐμαντός **4639**² 3
 ἐμός **4639**¹ ii 19
 ἐνθάδε [**4641** 21]
 ἐξεπίστασθαι **4639**² 3
 ἐπέχειν **4645** ii 8
 ἐπί **4644** 3 [**4646**¹ 6]
 ἐπιπλεῖν **4642** 13
 ἐπίστασθαι **4639**¹ ii 11?, 17
 ἐργάζεσθαι **4641** 12
 ἔρπειν **4639**¹ ii 8
 ἐσθίειν [**4641** 14]
 ἔστια- **4645** i 6
 ἔχγειν **4645** i 2
 ἔχθρ- **4639**¹ ii 15

Ζεύς **4642** 6

ἦ οἱ ἦ **4639**¹ ii 12, 16
 ἦμεῖς **4642** 4
 ἦττον **4643** 1

θεός [**4642** 5] **4644** 5
 θηγάτηρ **4641** 1 **4643** 11

ἱππεύειν **4639**¹ ii 6
 ἴσος **4642** 4

καί **4639**¹ ii 5, 10, 13, 16, ² 4 **4641** 17 **4642** 6, 10
4643 5

κακόν **4641** 6 **4645** ii 10
 κακ- **4639**¹ ii 3
 καλός **4645** ii 5
 καρτερεῖν **4641** 3
 κατά **4641** 17 **4646**¹ 9
 καταβάλλειν **4645** ii 9
 καταίρειν **4644** 2
 καταλείπειν **4645** i 6
 κατοικεῖν **4641** 21
 κραιπαλάν **4641** 8
 Κρήτη **4642** 9
 κρίνειν [**4642** 10?]

λέγειν **4641** 2, 7, 11, 19 **4642** [1], 8 **4643** 12, 13 **4645**
 i 5, 8, 9

μάλιστα **4645** ii 8
 μανθάνειν **4645** ii 12
 μάτην **4641** 15
 μέγας **4645** ii 3
 μεθύειν **4641** 8
 μέν **4642** 7 **4646**¹ 13
 μεστός **4645** ii 9
 μή **4641** 4
 μηδεῖς **4639**¹ ii 13
 μήτε **4639**¹ ii 3
 μόνον [**4641** 17]
 μύριοι **4641** 5

ναί [**4642** 2]
 νικᾶν **4639**¹ ii 11
 νοεῖν **4645** ii 10
 νυμφίος [**4645** ii 5?]
 νῦν **4641** 10

ξένος **4642** 11

οἶεσθαι **4643** 18
 οἴκειν **4641** 22?
 ὄπο- **4639**¹ ii 5
 ὄραν **4641** 15 **4642** 5 (*bis*), [7]
 ὀρίζειν **4639**¹ ii 4
 ὄς **4639**² 2
 ὄσος **4642** 7
 ὄταν **4639**¹ ii 10
 οὐ(κ) **4641** 7?, 19 **4642** 1, [4?]
 οὐδεῖς **4641** 11?, 19
 οὖν **4641** 9? **4642** 7 **4646**¹ 4
 οὐτε **4639**¹ ii 20
 οὐτι **4644** 4?
 οὐτος **4639**¹ ii 12 **4641** 1, 11 **4642** 1, 14 [**4646**¹ 3?]
 οὐτω(ς) **4642** 7 **4643** 8?

πάθος **4639**¹ ii 18?
 παῖς **4646**¹ 6
 πάλιν **4642** 14
 παρά **4641** 4, 18]
 παρεῖναι **4639**¹ ii 10 **4645** ii 5
 Παρμενίων **4642** 5 (superscript) **4643** 2
 πᾶς [**4645** ii 8?]
 πάσχειν **4639**¹ ii 18? **4646**¹ 10
 πείθω **4641** 3 **4645** ii 10
 πείρα **4641** 10
 Πειραιεύς **4644** 2
 περιεργάζεσθαι **4643** 20

πηρός **4645** ii 6?
 πλεῖν **4644** 4
 πλοῦσιον **4644** 4
 πλοῖον **4642** 9
 πλούτος [**4642** 4?]
 ποιεῖν **4641** 5 **4645** ii 9
 πολέμιος [**4642** 10?]
 πολύς [**4641** 13] **4642** 6
 πολυτίμητος **4642** 5
 Ποσειδών **4644** 6
 πραγμα- **4643** 8
 πραγματοκοπεῖν **4642** 2
 πρεσβεία **4646**^{2+3,1}
 προδοσία **4642** 12
 προῖξ **4646**¹ 8
 πρόνοια **4646**¹ 14
 πρός **4641** 20 **4644** 5?
 προσάγειν **4641** 10
 προσμένειν **4641** 16, [17]
 πυρέττειν [**4641** 13]

ῥωννύναι **4641** 12, 17 **4646**¹ 12

κύ **4641** 17 **4645** ii 7
 Κυρίκος **4641** 19 (suprascript)
 ὠτήρ **4642** 6
 ὠτηρία [**4641** 18]

τιθέναι [**4642** 4?]
 τίς, τί **4642** 7, 8 **4645** ii [7], 8 **4646**¹ 4
 τις, τι **4642** 1, 3, 11, 13 **4644** 4? [**4645** ii 8?] **4646**^{2+3,3}
 τοιούτος [**4641** 4]
 τότε **4646**^{2+3,2}
 τρίβειν **4639**² 5
 τρόπος **4643** 18
 τρόφιμος **4643** 4

ὑβρίζειν **4639**¹ ii 2
 ὑγιαίνειν **4641** 13 **4642** 7
 ὕμνις **4643** 2?, 3?, 9? (marg.)

Φαῖδρος **4645** ii 5
 Φανίας **4642** 2, 5 (marg.)
 φιλόπολις **4645** ii 8
 φίλος **4642** 6
 φίλος **4639**¹ ii 9
 φράζειν **4641** 9
 φύσις **4646**¹ 4?

χάρις [**4642** 6]

ὦ, ᾧ **4641** 16 **4642** 5
 ὦς **4639**¹ ii 20 **4641** 10 **4642** 3, 6

b. **4640**

Ἀθηνᾶ οἱ Ἀθῆναι i 14
 Ἀθηναῖος i 5
 αἰσθάνεσθαι i 8
 ἀναλαμβάνειν i 13–14
 ἀποκνεῖν i 7
 ἀποκτείνειν i 3
 ἀποπλεῖν i 13
 ἀπώλεια [i 8]
 Ἀριάδνη i [6], 10, 14
 ἀσεβείν ii 9
 αὐτός i 4

βασιλεύς i 5
 βία ii 4
 βοηθεῖν i 4

γαμεῖν i 15
 γάμος i 16

Δαίδαλος i 4

δέ i 1, [8], 12, 15
 διακονεῖν i 7

ἐγχαράττειν ii [1]–2
 εἰς i 1, 2
 εἰσάγειν i 2
 ἔλεγχος ii [15]–16
 ἔμαντός i 13
 ἔξοδος [i 4]
 ἐπέ i 1
 ἐπιθυμία i 10
 εὐπλοεῖν i 14
 εὐρίσκειν [i 4]
 εὐσεβής i 6

ζητεῖν ii 17

Θησεύς i 6, 9, 12
 θυγάτηρ i [6], 17
 θυμ- i 15

Ἰππόλυτος ii 3
 καί i 3, 5, ii 8
 καθίζεω ii [14]–15
 κατασφάττειν ii 1
 κελεύει i 16, ii 11, [13]–14
 κίνδυνος i 9
 Κρήτη i 1
 λαβύρινθος [i 3]
 μέν i 11
 μεσο- i 16–[17]
 μετά ii 4, 8
 Μίνως i [8], 15
 Μινώταυρος i 3, 8–9
 νέος (νεωτέρα) i 17
 ὀργή i 16

ἀγεννής [4648 24]
 ἀγλάϊσμα 4647¹ 4
 ἀγνοεῖν [4648 16]
 αἰνίττειν 4648 3
 ἀκριβοῦν 4648 6–7
 ἀλλά 4648 6, 8, [14]
 ἄμητος [4648 18–19]
 ἄν 4648 29
 ἀνατολή [4648 4]
 ἄνθρωπος 4647² 5
 ἀξιοπίστως 4648 11
 ἀπιστεῖν 4648 10
 Ἄρατος 4648 23
 ἄροτος [4648 20]
 Ἀσκραῖος 4648 15
 ἄστρον 4648 [4], 7
 αὖ 4648 1
 αὐτός 4647² 3?, 10
 ἄφθονος 4647¹ 2
 βέβαιος [4648 16]

γάρ 4647¹ 5
 γεωργία 4648 16
 γεωργός [4648 15]

οὐ(κ) i 7, ii 8
 παῖς i 2
 παρθένος ii 5
 παρίστημι i 12
 πατήρ i 11, ii 18?
 περί i 9
 πιστεύειν ii 7
 πολὺς ii 6, [8]
 πρὸς i 6
 πρῶτον i 11
 ῥαδίως i 3–4
 συναγωνιᾶν i 6
 ὑπομένειν i 1
 -αξιοῦν i 12
 -λείπειν ii 10

II. PROSE

γίγνεσθαι 4648 24 4650 9
 γινώσκειν [4648 14]
 γινώσις [4648 29–30]

δέ 4647¹ 2, ² 5, ² 9 4648 2, [7], [15], [16], 19, [23], 33
 4649¹ 3 4652 fol. i i 3

δή 4648 23
 διάπειρα 4648 13
 διαιτᾶσθαι 4647¹ 2–3
 δικαίως 4648 29
 διοικεῖν 4648 4
 δοκεῖν 4647¹ 3

ἐγκώμιον 4647³ 6
 εἶναι 4647¹ 4 4648 15, 20
 εἰρήνη 4648 1
 εἰς 4648 13
 ἐκ 4648 1
 ἐλάττων 4647¹ 4–5
 Ἐλευσίνιος 4648 30
 ἐν 4647¹ 2 4648 [8], 8
 ἐξορμᾶν [4648 19]
 ἐπί 4648 18, 19
 ἐπικροτεῖν 4652 fol. 2 i 4–5
 εὐθὺς 4647¹ 6

ζηλωτής **4648** 23-4

ἡδυεπής [**4648** 14]

ἦκειν **4648** 13

ἦμεῖς [**4648** 5]

ἡπειρώτης [**4648** 14-15]

θεραπεία **4647** ² 2?

θώραξ **4647** ² 10

Ἰλιάς [**4648** 8-9]

ἵνα **4648** 10

ἵππεύειν [**4647** ¹ 5-6]

ἵππος **4647** ² 4-5, ³ 5

καθάπερ [**4648** 20]

καί **4647** ¹ 6, ² 2, 4?, 5, 6, 9 **4648** 1, [6], 6, 8, [11], 11,
12, 15, 18, 20, 21, [22], 28

κάλυμμα **4647** ² 11

κατά [**4648** 5, 7]

καταμετρεῖν [**4648** 17]

Κέρβερος **4650** 1

κλει(-) **4648** 2

Κλωθώ **4650** 8

κοσμεῖν **4647** ² 4?

κράνος **4647** ² 8

λέγειν **4648** 25, 29

μάρπτειν **4652** fol. 1 i 5

μέν **4647** ¹ 5, ² 8 [**4648** 14]

μεταλαμβάνειν **4647** ¹ 12

μή **4648** 10, 29

μηδέ **4648** 24

μόνος **4648** 5, 8

ναυτικός [**4648** 15-16]

Ναύπλιος [**4648** 33]

νησιώτης **4648** 12

ὄδε [**4648** 29]

Ὀδύσσεια [**4648** 8]

οἰκειοῦν [**4648** 5-6]

οἶος **4647** ¹ 5

ὄλω **4648** 21

ὁμοίως **4648** 14

ὄρφανός **4648** 30

ὄς **4648** 23

ὄσος **4647** ² [8], 10

ὄταν **4647** ² 3? [**4648** 22]

ὄτε **4648** 20

οὐ(κ) **4647** ¹ 4 **4648** 5, [7-8], [24]

οὐρανός **4648** 2, [7]

οὗτος **4648** 14, [30]

ὄχημα **4647** ¹ 8

πάλιν **4648** 1

πανήγυρις **4647** ² 4

παραδιδόναι **4648** 7

παραδόξος **4647** ¹ 10

παραμηρίδιον **4647** ² 9-10

πᾶς **4648** 4

παρεῖναι **4648** 22

πλαγιάζειν **4652** fol. 3 i 3-4

πλοῦς **4648** 13

πλούτος **4647** ¹ 3

πόλεμος **4648** 1-2

πομπή **4647** ² 3

προλέγειν **4648** 23

προμετωπίδιον **4647** ² 7

προστερνίδιον **4647** ² 8-9

προοικονομεῖν **4648** 10

ῥῆσις [**4648** 29]

σεμνύνειν **4648** 6

σοφιστής **4648** 5

Σοφοκλῆς **4648** 33

συμπολιζειν **4647** ² 6-7

ευστρατεύεσθαι **4647** ² 5-6

σφάλειν **4648** 25

σῶμα **4647** ² 11

τε [**4648** 11]

τιμᾶν **4647** ² 3?

τις **4648** 21, 22, 29

τότε [**4648** 19]

τραγωδεῖν [**4648** 31]

φάναι **4648** 2, [9], [22] **4649** ² 1

ῶρα [**4648** 17]

ᾠρίων **4648** 20

ὦς **4648** [23], 24

ὥστε [**4648** 5]

-σορος **4648** 12

CITATIONS OF KNOWN AUTHORS

- Aesch. *Agam.* 4-5 **4648** 31-3
 Soph. *Naupl.* TGrFIV 432 **4648** 33
 Callim. *Epigr.* 27.1-3 Pf. **4648** 25-8
 Hes. *Op.* 219-23 **4651** 2-8
 383 **4648** 17-18
 384 **4648** 19
 567 **4648** 22
 Hes. *Scut.* 243 **4652** fol. 1 i 2
 245 **4652** fol. 1 i 4-5
 308? **4652** fol. 2 i 2?, 5
 387? **4652** fol. 3 i 2
 389 **4652** fol. 3 i 3, 5
 Hes. *Theog.* 6-7 or 8 **4649** fr. 2.1-4
 218-19? **4650** 8-9
 311? **4650** 1
 Hom. *Il.* 10.252-3 **4648** 9-10
 Hom. *Od.* 5.272 **4648** 11

III. SUBLITERARY TEXTS

a. SCRIBAL PRACTICE AND DRAFT

- Ἀρκαδία **4671** 1
 αἴθνια **4669** 2, 4
 εὐοικένας **4669** 2, 4
 εὐτυχῶς **4670** 1
 ἡμέρα **4670** 3
 καλός **4670** 3
 ὄρος **4669** 3
 Περργάμιος **4670** 2

b. MAGIC

- αβαωθ (?) **4674** 7
 ἀγαπᾶν **4672** 6-7, 12
 ἄγγελος **4672** 1
 ἀγρυνπεῖν **4672** 11
 ἀγώγιμον **4674** 1
 ἀληθινός **4674** 5
 ἄν **4673** 27
 Ἄνιλλα **4674** 9
 ανοχ (Coptic first person personal pronoun) **4674** 5
 Ἀνάγκη **4673** 30
 Ἀρβαθιαω **4674** 8
 ατρακ[**4672** 9
 αὐτός **4672** 4, 8-9, [15] **4673** 26 **4674** 11, 14 (*bis*)
 βασιλεύς **4674** 4
 γῆ **4674** 3
 δαίμων **4674** 2, 3
 δέ **4672** 1
 δεῖνα **4672** 3, 4, 6 (*bis*), [12], [13] **4674** 13 (*bis*), 16, 17
 (*bis*)
 διδόνας **4674** 10
 δύνασθαι **4674** 4
 ἐγώ **4672** 1, 6 (*bis*), 7 (*bis*), [12] (*bis*), [13] **4674** 10, 17
 εἶναι **4672** 2
 ἐκ **4674** 14
 Ἐκάτη **4672** 1 (*bis*)
 ἐκσπᾶν **4674** 13
 Ἐλενος **4673** 26
 ἔμπυρον **4674** 1
 ἐν **4672** 3
 ἔντερον **4674** 15
 *ἐξαναπηδάω **4672** 5
 ἐξορκίζεω **4673** 18, 29
 ἐπί **4672** 8, 14 **4674** 1
 ἐπικαλεῖν **4674** 2, 9, 11
 ἔστε **4673** 27
 ἔως **4672** 5
 ζητεῖν **4672** 7, 13
 ζωή **4672** [8], [14]

ἤδη **4674** 17
 ἡου **4674** 5

θαλάσσιος **4672** 1

ἰέναι **4672** 5
 ἴνα **4674** 10
 Ἰσιδώρα **4673** [23]
 ἰστάναι **4672** 2

καί **4672** 2 (*bis*), 6, 7 **4674** 3
 καίειν **4674** 14–15
 κατά **4673** 29
 κεφαλή **4672** 3
 κραταιός **4673** 30

λέγειν **4674** 5
 λευκός **4673** 28

μασκελλι μασκελλω **4673** 30–1
 μέγας **4674** 2, 3
 μέλας **4673** 29

Νύξ **4672** 1

οἰκία **4674** 14
 ὄνομα **4674** 5
 ὅπως **4674** 16
 ὅς **4672** 3 **4673** 23, 26 **4674** 17
 ὄστρακον **4674** 1
 ὅτι **4673** 29
 οὐρανός **4674** 3–4
 ὄφελος **4674** 4

περιαίρειν **4672** 4
 Πνουκενταβαωθ **4674** 12
 πορεύεσθαι **4672** 2 **4674** 12
 πρὸς **4672** 3, 5 **4674** 13

σεβανα **4674** 6
 σπλάγχνον **4674** 15
 κύ **4673** 18, 29 **4674** 2, 5
 συμπαριστάναι **4674** 10
 συνάπτειν **4673** 28
 συνουσία **4672** 8, 14

ταβαωθ **4674** 8
 Τάησις **4674** 9
 Ταπιαμ **4673** 27
 Ταῖων **4674** 9
 ταχύς **4674** 17, 18
 *(τα)τρακα (?) **4672** 9–10
 *τετρακύων **4672** 10
 *τῆτρ[α]υλάκτ[ης] (?) **4672** 10–11
 τίκτειν **4672** 3 **4673** 23, 26 **4674** 17
 τύραννος **4674** 3

ὕμεις **4674** 9, 11
 ὕπνος **4672** 4

φθαμοθ **4674** 6
 φιλεῖν **4672** 6, 12
 φοιτᾶν (?) **4674** 11
 φρικτός **4674** 4
 φως (?) **4674** 11

χείλος **4673** 27 (*bis*)
 χρόνος **4672** 9, [15]

IV. RULERS

DIOCLETIAN AND MAXIMIAN

(year 20 and 19; no titulature **4670** r 2)

THEODOSIUS II AND VALENTINIAN

οἱ τὰ πάντα νικῶντες δεσπότες ἡμῶν Φλάουῖοι Θεοδόσιος
 Οὐαλεντινιανός οἱ αἰώνιοι Αὐγουστοὶ **4688** 7–9

V. CONSULS

- 408 ὑπατείας Φλαουίων Βάσσου καὶ Φιλίππου τῶν λαμπροτάτων **4677** 1-2
- 409 ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Ὀνωρίου τὸ η καὶ Θεοδοσίου τὸ γ τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀγούστων **4678** 1-2
- 418 ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Ὀνωρίου τὸ ιβ καὶ Θεοδοσίου τὸ η τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀγούστων **4679** 1-3
- 419 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Ὀνωρίου τὸ ιβ καὶ Θεοδοσίου τὸ η τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀγούστων **4681** 1-2
- 421 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου τὸ θ καὶ Φλαουίου Κωνσταντίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου τὸ γ **4682** 1-3
- 431 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου τὸ ιγ καὶ Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ τὸ γ τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀγούστων **4684** 1-2
- 440 ὑπατείας Φλαουίου Ἀνατολίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου **4686** 1
- 441 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου τὸ ε καὶ Φλαουίου Ἀνατολίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου **4687** 1-2
- 442 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαουίου Κύρου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου **4688** 2 **4689** 2 **4690** 1
- 453 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαουίου Σπορακίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ δηλωθησομένου **4691** 1-2 **4692** 1-2
- 466 ὑπατείας (sic) Φλαουίων Βασιλίσκου καὶ Ἐρμενερχ τῶν λαμπροτάτων **4693** 1
- 466 ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Φλαουίου Λέοντος τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου τὸ γ καὶ τοῦ δηλωθησομένου **4694** 1-2
- 472 ὑπατεία Φλαουίου Μαρκιανοῦ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ δηλωθησομένου **4695** 2-3
- 484 ὑπατεία Φλαουίου Θεοδωρίχου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου **4696** 2
- 489 ὑπατεία Φλαουίου Εὐσεβίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου **4697** 2
- 490 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαουίου Εὐσεβίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου **4698** 2-3
- 504 ὑπατεία Φλαουίου Κεθήγου τοῦ ἐνδοξοτάτου **4700** 1
- 505 ὑπατείας Φλαουίων Καβιριανοῦ καὶ Θεοδώρου τῶν λαμπροτάτων **4701** 1
- 520 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Φλαουίου Ἰουστίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου **4702** 1-2

VI. INDICATIONS AND ERAS

(a) INDICATIONS

- | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3rd indiction | 4681 10-11 (= 419/20) | 11th indiction | 4688 3 (= 442/3) 4689 9-10 (= 442/3) 4695 3 (= 472/3) |
| 4th indiction | 4693 2, 10 (= 465/6) | 12th indiction | 4699 3, 4 (= 503/4) |
| 5th indiction | 4694 2, 8 (= 466/7) | 13th indiction | 4697 2 (= 489/90) 4700 2 (= 504/5) 4702 2 (= 519/20) |
| 6th indiction | [4682 5] (= 422/3) | 14th indiction | 4698 4 (= 490/1) |
| 7th indiction | 4692 7 (= 453/4) | 15th indiction | 4704 3, 5 (= 626/7) |
| 8th indiction | 4677 9 (= 409/10) 4696 2 (= 484/5) | | |
| 9th indiction | 4686 5-6 (= 440/1) | | |
| 10th indiction | 4687 7 (= 441/2) 4703 10 (= 621/2) | | |

(b) ERAS

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| 74/43 (?) = 397/8 | 4675 4 | 119/88 = 442/3 | 4689 9 [4690 8] |
| 81/50 = 404/5 | 4676 3 | 130/99 = 453/4 | 4692 7 |
| [86/55 = 409/10] | 4679 9 | 142/111 = 465/6 | 4693 9 |
| 95/64 = 418/9 | 4680 3 4681 10 | 143/112 = 466/7 | 4694 8 |
| 98/67 = 421/2 | [4682 8] | 180/149 = 503/4 | 4699 3 |
| 103/72 = 426/7 | 4683 4 | 303/272 = 626/7 | 4704 5 |
| 117/86 = 440/1 | 4686 6 [4687 7] | | |

VII. MONTHS

Θώθ 4676 3 4677 2 4686 1, 5 4689 3, 9 4690 1 4692 6 4695 2 4696 2 4704 3, 5	Μεχείρ 4680 3 4702 2
Φαώφι 4678 2 4682 3 4683 3 4698 3	Φαμενώθ 4693 1 4693 8
Ἀθύρ 4700 2	Φαρμούθι 4691 2
Χοιάκ 4679 3 4683 4 4694 2	Παχών 4703 3
Τῦβι 4694 7 4697 1, [16] 4699 [2], 3, 4	Παῦνι 4687 2
	Μεσορή 4681 3, 10 4692 2

VIII. DATES

303/4 4670 r 2	29 August 442 4689 2-3
397/8? 4675 4	10 September 442 4690 1
6 September 404 4676 3	16 April 453 4691 1-2
26 September 408 4677 1-2	31 July 453 4692 1-2
18 October 409 4678 1-2	27 (?) February 466 4693 1-2
21 December 418 4679 1-3	14 December 466 4694 1-2
11 February 419 4680 3	31 August 472 4695 2-3
10 (?) August 419 4681 1-2	2 September 484 4696 2
9 (?) October 421 4682 1-3	27-31 December 489 4697 2
1 December 426 4683 4	3 October 490 4698 2-4
431 4684 1-2	23 January 504 4699 3
5 September 440 4686 1	18 November 504 4700 1-2
26 May 441 4687 1-2	505? 4701 1
1 May-24 June 442? 4688 2-3	5 February 520 4702 1-2

IX. PERSONAL NAMES

Ἄγαθος, s. of Agathus 4685 back 5, ?11	Ἄπακῦρος, f. of Aur. Aninus 4696 7
Ἄγαθος, f. of Agathus 4685 back 5, [?11]	Ἄπις, f. of Aur. Pecysis 4697 6
Ἄείων, f. of Aur. Apphus 4695 7	Ἄπίων 4703 4
Ἄθανάσιος 4683 1	Ἄπολλῶς, Aur., ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός, s. of — and Anna 4697 5, 17
Ἄθανάσιος <i>curialis</i> 4690 5	Ἄπφοῦς, f. of Aur. Phoebammon 4695 4
Ἄθανάσιος 4699 2	Ἄπφοῦς, Aur., s. of Aeion 4695 4, 7
Ἄμβροσία 4685 front 8	Ἄτας, s. of Anutius 4685 back 9
Ἄνατόλιος, Fl., <i>vir clarissimus</i> , consul 440 4686 1 4687 2; <i>see also</i> Index V s.vv. AD 440, 441	Ἄτρῆς, f. of Thaesia 4681 6
Ἄνωος, Aur., s. of Apacyrus and Casia 4696 7	Ἄγουστος 4678 2 4679 2 4681 2 4682 2 [4684 2] [4687 2] 4688 9 4694 1 4702 2; <i>see also</i> Index II
Ἄννα, m. of Aur. Apollon 4697 6	Ἀρηλία, <i>see</i> s.vv. Θαρεσία, Πῖνα
Ἄννα, Aur., d. of Ioseph 4698 5	Ἀρήλιος 4688 5; <i>see also</i> s.vv. Ἄνωος, Ἄπολλῶς, Δωρόθεος, Εὐλόγιος, Ἰερακίων, Ἰωάννης, Πέτρος, Καρμάτης, Τραϊανός, Φιλέας, Φιλόξενος, Ψά(ε)ιος, -άμ]μων, -ης, -c
Ἄνούθιος, Aur., s. of Pamunius, λευκαντής 4689 6	
Ἄνούπ, Aur., s. of Paulus 4703 6, 8	
Ἄνούτιος, f. of Atas 4685 back 9	
Ἄντιόχος, f. of Fl. Serenus 4700 5	

- Βασιλικός, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 465 **4693** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 466
- Βάσσο, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 408 **4677** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 408
- Βηγάς, f. of Aur. Psaeius **4686** 4
- Γερμανός, f. of Aur. Phileas **4700** 7
- Δανυήλ, Fl., s. of Valerius, *vir clarissimus* **4682** 4 **4685** back 8
- Δανυήλ **4683** 1
- Δανυήλ, s. of Macrobius, *curialis* **4685** back 7
- Διονύσιος, *πρεσβύτερος* **4678** 4
- Δωρόθεος, Aur., s. of Sosibius **4681** 4
- Δωρόθεος, f. of Paulus **4685** 6
- Ἐρμενεριχ, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 465 **4693** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 466
- Ἐθήτιος **4675** 1
- Ἐθλόγιος **4685** back 8
- Ἐθλόγιος, s. of Horion, Aur. **4686** 2 Fl., *palatinus* **4693** 3 **4694** 2
- Ἐδέβιος, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 489 **4697** 1 **4698** 2–3; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 489, 490
- Ε., m. of Aur. Pecysis **4697** 6
- Ἡραΐς, m. of Aur. Phileas **4700** 7–8
- Ἠσύχιος, f. of Fl. Isac **4689** 4
- Θαησία, Aur., d. of Hatres **4681** 6, 15
- Θεόδωρος, s. of Leucadius, *curialis* **4685** back 1
- Θεόδωρος, s. of P— **4685** back 3
- Θεόδωρος **4690** 5
- Θεόδωρος, *παῖς* **4699** 2
- Θεόδωρος, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 505 **4701** 1, *see also* Index V s.v. AD 505
- Θεοδόσιος Augustus, consul 409, 418, 420, 430 **4678** 1 **4679** 2 **4681** 2 **4682** 1 **4684** 1; **4688** 8; *see also* Index IV, Index V s.v. AD 409, 418, 419, 421, 431
- Θεοδώριχος, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 484 **4696** 2; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 484
- Θέων **4685** back 2, 6
- Ἰακώβ, *ποταμίτης* **4704** 2
- Ἰερακίων **4685** back 4
- Ἰερακίων, Aur., son of Pecysis **4692** 4
- Ἰούκτωρ *see* Οὐίκτωρ
- Ἰουλι- **4685** back 1
- Ἰουστίνος, Fl., Augustus, consul 519 **4702** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 519
- Ἰσάκ, Fl., *stationarius*, s. of Hesychius **4689** 4
- Ἰωάννης, Aur., s. of Horion **4682** 5
- Ἰωάννης, Fl., *vir spectabilis*, *comes sacri consistorii*, *curialis* **4696** 4; f. of Fl. Phoebammon and Fl. Samuel(ius) **4697** 3 **4701** 7
- Ἰωάννης, *comes* **4699** 1
- Ἰωάννης, f. of Phoebammon **4702** 4
- Ἰωάννης, Aur., s. of Onnophris and Sophia, b. of Philoxenus **4702** 5
- Ἰωσήφ, Fl., *tribunus* **4684** 3
- Ἰωσήφ, *vir clarissimus* **4685** back 3
- Ἰωσήφ, f. of Aur. Anna **4698** 5
- Καρία, m. of Aur. Aninus **4696** 7
- Κέθηγος, Fl., *vir gloriosissimus*, consul 504 **4700** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 504
- Κυριακή παιδική **4680** 2
- Κύρος, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 441 **4688** 2 **4689** 2 **4690** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 442
- Κωνσταντίος, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 410 **4682** 2; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 421
- Λεόντιος, f. of Aur. Petrus **4690** 3
- Λευκάδιος, f. of Theodorus **4685** back 1
- Λέων, Fl., Augustus, consul 466 **4694** 1 *see also* Index V s.v. AD 466 (*bis*)
- Μακάριος **4685** front 8
- Μακρόβιος, f. of Daniel, *curialis* **4685** back 7
- Μαρκιανός, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 472 **4695** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 472
- Μέλας **4685** back 7
- Νέπω, *ελαουργός* **4680** 1
- Ἵννώφρις, f. of Aur. Philoxenus and Ioannes **4702** 6
- Ἵνώριος Augustus, consul 409, 418 **4678** 1 **4679** 1 **4681** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 409, 418, 419
- Οὐαλεντιανός Augustus, consul 430, 440 **4684** 2; **4687** 1; **4688** 9; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 431, 441
- Οὐαλέριος, *vir clarissimus*, f. of Daniel **4682** 5 **4685** back 8
- Οὐίκτωρ **4685** back 4
- Οὐρικίνος **4676** 2
- Παμόνιος, f. of Aur. Anuthius **4689** 6
- Παῦλος, s. of Dorotheus **4685** front 6

- Παῦλος, f. of Aur. Anup **4703** 7
 Περούς, f. of Aur. — ammon **4677** 5
 Πεκύσιος, f. of Aur. Hieracion **4692** 4
 Πέκυσις, Aur., ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός, s. of Apis **4697** 6, 17
 Πέτρος, Aur., s. of Leontius **4690** 3
 Πέτρος, f. of Aur. — s **4692** 3
 Πίνα, Aur., d. of Sarapammon **4693** 6, 17
 Πτολεμῖνος **4676** 1, *vir clarissimus* **4685** back 2

 Καβινιανός, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 505 **4701** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 505
 Καμουήλ(ιος), Fl., s. of Ioannes, b. of Phoebammon, *vir clarissimus* **4697** 2, *magnificentissimus et spectabilis comes sacri consistorii* **4701** 5–6
 Καρμάτης, Aur. **4688** 10
 Καραπάμμων, f. of Aur. Pina **4693** 6
 Κερήνος, Fl., στρατιώτης, s. of Antiochus **4700** 3
 Κέργιος, προνοητής **4704** 2
 Κοφία, m. of Aur. Philoxenus and Ioannes **4702** 6
 Κοπάκιος, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 452 **4691** 1 **4692** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 453
 Κρατήγιος, *vir clarissimus* **4685** back 6
 Κωσίβιος, f. of Aur. Dorotheus **4681** 4

 Τατιανός **4680** 1, *curialis* **4685** back 5
 Τιμαγένης, *vir clarissimus*, f. of Fl. Ioannes **4696** 5
 Τιμόθεος **4685** back 12
 Τραιανός, Aur. **4687** 4

 Φίλας, Aur., s. of Germanus and Herais **4700** 6–7

 Φίλιππος, Fl., *vir clarissimus*, consul 408 **4677** 1; *see also* Index V s.v. AD 408
 Φιλόξενος, Aur., s. of Onnophris and Sophia, b. of Ioannes **4702** 5
 Φλάουῖος **4677** 1; *see also* s.vv. Ἀνατόλιος, Βασιλίκος, Βάσκος, Δανήλ, Ἑρμενεριχ, Εὐλόγιος, Εὐσέβιος, Θεόδωρος, Θεοδώριχος, Ἰουστίνος, Ἰσάκ, Ἰωάννης, Ἰωσήφ, Κέθηγος, Κύρος, Κωνστάντιος, Λέων, Μαρκιανός, Καβινιανός, Καμουήλ, Κερήνος, Κοπάκιος, Φίλιππος, Φοιβάμμων
 Φοιβάμμων, s. of D— **4685** back 10
 Φοιβάμμων, Aur., s. of Apphus **4695** 3, 11
 Φοιβάμμων, Fl., s. of Ioannes, b. of Samuel(ius), *vir clarissimus* **4697** 2 *magnificentissimus et gloriosissimus comes devotissimorum domesticorum* **4701** 3–4
 Φοιβάμμων, οἰνοχεριτής **4699** 1
 Φοιβάμμων, πρεσβύτερος, s. of Ioannes **4702** 3
 Φοιβάμμων, ποταμίτης **4704** 2

 Ψά(ε)ῖος, Aur., s. of Besas **4686** 1

 Ωρίων, f. of Aur. Ioannes **4682** 5
 Ωρίων, f. of Aur. Eulogius **4686** 2 (Fl. Eulogius) **4693** 4 **4694** 4
 Ωρος, f. of — b **4694** 5

 -άμ]μων, Aur. **4677** 5 **4690** 2
 -αν]τίσιος **4691** 3
 -ς, Aur. **4698** 6–7
 -ς, Aur., s. of Petrus **4692** 3
] . . β], d. of Horus **4694** 5
 -, Fl., *ex praepositis* **4677** 3

X. GEOGRAPHICAL

- Γερωντίου (ἔδαφος) **4687** 9
 Δ. [(ἐποίκιον) **4696** 8
 Ἐξαγορίου (ἄμφοδον) **4689** 11
 Θηβαϊκός **4683** 3
 Ἰππέων Παρεμβολῆς (ἄμφοδον) **4693** 11–12
 Μερμέρθα (κώμη) **4687** 9
 Νεοφύτου Ἀντιόχου (ἐποίκιον) **4702** 7

 Ὄξυρυγχίτης (νομός) [**4684** 3] **4697** 8 **4702** 7
 Ὄξυρυγχιτῶν πόλις **4681** 8 **4692** 3–4 **4694** 4–5 **4698** 6 **4702** 4 **4703** 6; ἡ λαμπρὰ καὶ λαμπροτάτη Ὄξ. π. **4677** 4 **4678** 3 **4681** 4–5 **4686** 2–3 **4687** 3–4 **4688** 5 **4689** 5–6 **4690** 2–3 **4693** 5 **4695** 5–6 **4696** 6–7; ἡ λαμπρὰ Ὄξ. π. **4700** 6
 Ὄξυρύγχων (sc. πόλις) **4688** 3 **4696** 3 **4701** 2 **4702** 2

 Παρθενιάδος (ἐποίκιον) **4704** 2
 Πέκτυ (κώμη) **4677** 6

 Σένυρις (κώμη) **4682** 6
 Σιδαλα (ἐποίκιον) **4697** 7

Τακόνα (κώμη) **4681** 6-7
 Ταπχοχ (μηχανή) **4697** 10
 Τευμενούθεως (ἄμφοδοῦν) **4681** 13

Φαρανίτης *see* Index XII

-μωνος (?ἐποίκιον) **4687** 5

XI. RELIGION

(a) GENERAL

ἄγιος **4702** 3

παντοκράτωρ **4688** 7

δεσπότης (Christ) **4703** 1

πρεσβύτερος **4678** 4 **4702** 3

ἐκκλησία **4702** 4

ᾠστήρ **4703** 2

Θεός [**4688** 7] **4703** 2

χμγ **4688** 1 **4689** 1 **4695** 1 **4696** 1 **4697** 1 **4698** 1

κύριος (Christ) **4703** 1

Χριστός **4703** 2

(b) INVOCATION

ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ᾠστήρος ἡμῶν **4703** 1-3

XII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS AND TITLES

ἀριθμός **4690** 6 **4700** 3

4690 1 **4691** 1 [**4692** 2] **4693** 1 **4695** 1 **4696** 2 **4697** 1, 2 **4698** 3 **4700** 6 **4701** 1

γενναιότατος **4700** 4

μεγαλοπρέπεια **4697** 8, 9

δεσπότης (emperor) [**4678** 1] [**4679** 1] **4681** 1 **4682** 1
4684 1 **4687** 1 **4688** 8 **4694** 1 **4702** 1

μεγαλοπρεπέστατος **4701** 3, 5

δομestικός **4701** 4

παλατίνος **4693** 3 **4694** 3

ἔνδοξος **4703** 3; ἐνδοξότατος **4700** 1 **4701** 3-4

περίβλεπτος **4696** 4 **4697** 3 **4701** 5, 7

εὐκλεής **4703** 5

πολιτευόμενος **4678** 3 **4685** back 1, 5, 7, 11 **4687** 3

ἰνδικτίων **4677** 9 **4681** 11 [**4682** 9] **4686** 7 **4687** 7

4688 4 **4690** 5 **4696** 5 **4701** 6

4688 3 **4689** 10 [**4692** 7] **4693** 2 **4693** 10 **4694** 2,
 8 **4695** 2 **4696** 2 [**4697** 1] **4698** 4 **4699** 3, 4 **4700** 2
4702 2 **4703** 3 **4704** 3, 5, 6; *see also* Index III (a)

πραϊπόσιτος **4677** 3

καθωσιωμένος **4693** 3 **4694** 3 **4700** 4-5 **4701** 4

ρίπάριος **4684** 3

κόμη **4696** 4 **4701** [4], 5

στατιωνάριος **4689** 4

κονιστώριον (θεῖον κ.) **4696** 4 **4701** 6

στρατιώτης **4700** 3

λαμπρός (*clarissimae memoriae viv*) **4682** 4 **4696** 5

ὑπατεία [**4677** 1] [**4678** 1] **4679** 1 **4681** 1 **4682** 1 **4684**

λαμπρότατος (*vir clarissimus*) [**4677** 2] **4682** 4 **4685**
 back 2, 3, 6, 8, 10 **4686** 1 **4687** 2 **4688** 2 **4689** 2

1 **4686** 1 [**4687** 1] [**4688** 2] **4689** 2 [**4690** 1] [**4691**

1] [**4692** 1] **4693** 1 [**4694** 1] **4695** 1 **4696** 1 **4697** 1

[**4698** 2] **4700** 1 [**4701** 1] **4702** 1

Φαρανίτης **4700** 5

XIII. PROFESSIONS, TRADES, AND OCCUPATIONS

ἀρτοκόπος 4670 1 3	οἶνοχειριστής [4699 1]
γεωργός 4697 7	παιδάριον 4683 2 (4699 2?)
ἐλαιουργός 4680 1	παιδίσκη 4680 2
λευκαντής 4689 7	παῖς 4699 2 (?)
	ποταμίτης 4704 2, 6
	προνοητής 4704 2

XIV. MEASURES

(a) WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

ἄρουρα **4687** 10
(ἀρτάβη) **4685** front 5, 6, 8, 10 **4704** 3, 4, 6

διπλοῦν **4683** 3, 4 **4699** 3 (*ter*)

κάγκελλος **4704** 3, 4

ξέστης **4680** 2, 3

(b) MONEY

ἀργύριον **4693** 14

(δραχμή) **4670** 1 5
(δηναρίων μυριάδες) **4685** front 11

μυριάς **4693** 14

νομισμάτιον **4685** 11 [**4690** 6] **4694** 12, [13]

(τάλαντον) **4670** 1 5

XV. GENERAL INDEX OF WORDS

ἄγιος <i>see</i> Index XI (a)	4695 5, 7 [4696 8] 4697 7 4698 5, 7 4699 2 4700
ἀδελφός 4702 6	5 4702 4, 7 4704 3
αἰδέσιμος 4687 3 4688 4 4701 6	ἀποδιδόναι [4690 8] 4693 15 [4694 13]
αἰρεῖσθαι [4687 10]	ἀπότακτος 4687 11
αἰώνιος 4678 1 4679 2 4681 2 4682 2 [4684 2] 4687	ἀργύριον <i>see</i> Index XIV (b)
1 4688 9 4694 1 4702 1	ἀριθμός <i>see</i> Index XII
ἀκίνδυνος [4690 7]	ἄρουρα <i>see</i> Index XIV (a)
ἀκολούθως 4702 10	ἀρτάβη <i>see</i> Index XIV (a)
ἄμφοδον 4681 12 4689 11 4693 11 [4694 10]	ἀρτοκόπος <i>see</i> Index XIII
ἄμφοτερος 4688 11 [4697 6] 4701 6 4702 5	αὐθαίρετος 4688 9–10
ἀναδέχεσθαι 4688 10	αὐτός 4677 6 4681 7, 12 4682 6 4686 4 4687 5 4688
ἀναπλήρωσις 4697 15	6 4689 7, 10 4692 5 4693 7, 11 4694 5 4695 6, 8
ἀντιφωνεῖν 4690 4	4696 8 4697 13 4698 7 4702 10
ἀντλεῖν 4697 10	
ἀπλός 4690 6	βέβαιος 4702 8
ἀπό [4677 6, 10] 4681 4, 6, 9, 11 4682 6, 7 4686 2, 5	βορράς 4693 12
4687 [5], 6, 7 4688 [6], 11 4689 5, 7, 8, 10 4690 2,	βούλεσθαι 4693 16
3 4691 3 4692 6 4693 4, 7, 8, 10 4694 4, 5, [7], 8	

- γένημα [4687 11] 4704 3
 γενναιότατος *see* Index XII
 γεουχεῖν [4677 4] 4696 6 4697 3
 γεουχικός [4697 9]
 γεωργός *see* Index XIII
 γί(γ)νεσθαι 4678 4 4680 2 4683 3 [4697 8] 4699 3
 (*bis*) 4704 4
 γνώμη [4688 10]
 γραμμάτιον 4700 9 4702 9
- δεκαεξί 4704 3
 δέκατος 4687 7
 δεσπότης *see* Index XI (a), XII
 δεσποτικός 4690 6
 δηλοῦν 4691 2 4692 2 4694 2 4695 2
 δηνάριον *see* Index XIV (b)
 διά 4690 5 4693 16 4694 13 4704 2
 διακείσθαι 4694 9 4703 5
 διατροφή 4699 2
 διδόναι 4690 5 4695 9 4704 2
 δίκαιον 4693 13 [4694 10]
 διπλοῦν *see* Index XIV (a)
 δόκιμος 4690 6
 δύο 4683 3, [4]
- εἰάν [4687 11]
 ἕβδομος 4692 7
 ἐγγνάσθαι [4688 10]
 ἐγγύη 4703 8
 ἐγώ 4690 5 4695 6, 9
 ἔδαφος 4677 11 4687 9
 εἶναι 4681 9, 12 4686 5 4689 8 4693 8 4697 16 4702
 8, 9
 εἰς 4687 10 4690 4 4697 9, [10], 15 4704 2
 εἰς 4680 2, 3 4681 13 4694 12 4697 11 4699 3 (*bis*)
 εἰσιέναι [4692 7] [4694 7]
 ἐκ 4689 12 4695 9 4702 6
 ἐκκλησία *see* Index XI (a)
 ἐκούσιος 4688 9
 ἐκουσίως 4677 7 4681 8 4682 7 4686 4 [4687 6]
 4689 7 4692 5 4693 7 4694 6
 ἔλαιον 4680 2, 3
 ἔλαιουργός *see* Index XIII
 ἐν 4677 [4], 10 4681 12 4686 4 [4687 9] 4688 3
 4689 10 4693 11 4696 3 4697 16 4701 2 4702 2
 4703 1, 5
 ἐναπόγραφος *see* Index XII
 ἔνατος 4686 6
 ἐνδέκατος 4689 9
- ἐνδοξος *see* Index XII
 ἐνιαυσίως 4693 14 [4694 12]
 ἐνιστάναι 4677 8 4681 10 4682 8 4686 6 4687 6
 4689 9 4690 8 4693 9 4694 7
 ἐνοίκιον 4681 14 4693 14, [15] 4694 11–12
 ἐνταῦθα 4681 8 4696 6 4697 3
 ἐξάμηνος 4693 16 4694 13
 ἐξῆς 4703 7
 ἐξαιτεῖν 4697 12
 ἐξω 4704 3
 ἐπάναγκες 4690 7
 ἐπί 4681 12 4689 11 4692 5 4693 11, 12 4694 9, [10]
 4704 3
 ἐπιδέχεσθαι 4677 7 4681 9 4682 7 4686 5 [4687 6]
 4689 8 [4692 6] 4693 7 4694 6
 ἐπιτήδειος 4697 14
 ἐποίκιον [4677 6] [4687 4] 4688 11 [4696 8] 4697 7
 4702 7; *see also* Index X
 ἐπομύναι [4688 7]
 ἐργάζεσθαι 4704 2
 ἐργάτης 4697 11
 ἔτος 4677 8 4680 3 4681 10 4682 8 4683 4 4686 6
 4687 6 4689 9 4690 8 [4692 7] 4693 9, 15 4694 8,
 [13] 4699 3 4704 5
 εὐάρεστος 4697 14
 εὐγένεια 4693 11 [4694 9]
 εὐκλής *see* Index XII
 εὐλάβεια 4702 9
 εὐλαβής 4702 3
 εὐρέβεια 4688 7
 εὐσταθμος 4690 6
 εὐτυχής 4682 8
- ἡμεῖς [4678 1] [4679 1] 4681 1 4682 1 4684 1 4687 1
 4694 1 4697 9, 13, [14] 4702 1, 8 4703 3
 ἡμέρα 4697 16
 ἡμενος 4689 11 4693 16 4694 12, [14]
 ἦτοι 4687 8
- θαυμασιότης 4687 5
 θεῖος 4696 4 [4701 6]
 θεός *see* Index XI (a)
 Θηβαϊκός *see* Index X
 θυγάτηρ 4693 6 4694 5 4698 5
- ἰνδικτίων *see* Index XII
 κάγκελλος *see* Index XIV (a)
 καθοσιούν *see* Index XII s.v. καθωσιωμένος
 καινός 4697 14

- καλεῖν [4687 10]
κατά 4693 15 [4694 13] 4703 6
καταγύ(γ)νεσθαι 4681 7
καταμένειν 4686 4
κίνδυνος 4690 7
κληρονόμος 4678 4 4685 back 2, 4, 6
κόμης *see* Index XII
κονιστώριον *see* Index XII
κτῆμα [4697 7]
κυκλάς 4697 11
κυλλή (?) 4697 10
κύριος 4683 2 4699 2 4702 8; *see also* Index XI (a)
κώμη 4681 6 4682 6 [4687 9]. 4691 3; *see also*
Index X
- λαμπρός [4677 2, 4] 4678 3 4681 4-5 4682 3, 4 4685
back 2, 3, 6, 8, 10 4686 1, 2, 3 4687 1, 3, 4 4688 2, 5
4689 2, 5 4690 1, 2 4691 1 [4692 2] 4693 1, 5 4695
1, 5 4696 2, 5, 6 4697 1, 2, 4-5 4698 3 4700 6; *see*
also Index X s.v. Ὁξυρυγχιτῶν πόλις, *and* Index XII
- λέγειν 4697 12
λευκαντής *see* Index XIII
λόγος 4699 2 4704 3
- μακάριος 4693 4 4694 4 4702 4 4703 7
μέγας 4697 11
μεγαλοπρέπεια *see* Index XII
μεγαλοπρεπέστατος *see* Index XII
μαῖς (μήν) 4681 9 4686 5 4689 8 4693 8 [4694 7]
4699 2, 4 4703 3 4704 3, 5
μέρος 4689 11
μετά 4681 1 4682 1 4683 1 4684 1 [4687 1] [4688 2]
4689 2 [4690 1] [4691 1] [4692 1] 4698 2 4702 1
μήτηρ 4696 7 4697 [5], 6 4700 7 4702 6
μηχανή [4697 9]
μηχανικός [4697 12, 13, 15]
μειθός 4704 3
μειθοῦν [4677 7-8] 4681 9 4682 7 4686 5 4687 6
4689 8 4692 6 4693 8 4694 6
μίθωσις 4681 15 4693 17
μνήμη 4682 4 4693 4 4694 4 4696 5 4697 3 4701
7 4703 5
μόνος 4677 8 [4683 3, 4] 4699 3 4704 4
μονόχωρον 4693 12
μυριάς *see* Index XIV (b)
- νεόφυτος 4704 2
νεύειν 4693 12
νικᾶν [4688 8]
- νομισμάτιον *see* Index XIV (b)
νομός 4677 6 4681 7 4682 6 4687 5 [4696 8] 4697 8
4702 7; *see also* Index X
νῦν [4697 8]
- ξέστης *see* Index XIV (a)
- ὄγδοος 4677 9
ὄδε 4694 9
οἰκία 4681 11-12 4689 12 4694 10
οἶκος 4703 4
οἶνος 4683 3, 4 4699 [2], 3 (*ter*)
οἶνοχειριστής *see* Index XIII
ὀλόκληρος 4689 12 4693 12 4694 10
ὀμογνήσιος 4702 5
ὀμολογεῖν 4688 6 4690 3 4702 10
ὀμολογία 4695 11 4698 8
ὄνομα 4703 1
ὄπερ [4693 15] [4694 13]
ὄπoptan 4693 16
ὄργανον [4697 12, 13, 15]
ὀρμάσθαι 4702 6
ὄς 4687 10
ὄστις 4697 16
ὀφείλειν [4690 4]
- παιδάριον *see* Index XIII
παιδική *see* Index XIII
παῖς *see* Index XIII
παλαιός 4704 3
παλατινός *see* Index XII
παντοκράτωρ *see* Index XI (a)
παρά [4677 5] 4681 6 4682 5 4686 3 4687 4 4689 6
4690 4 4693 6 4702 9
παραδιδόναι 4693 16
παρεῖναι 4686 6 4693 9
παρέχειν 4675 2 4676 2 4680 2 4683 2 4697 13, 14
4699 2
πᾶς 4681 14 [4688 8] 4689 12 4690 7 4693 13
[4694 11]
πατήρ 4695 6 4702 6
πεδίον [4687 9]
πέμπτος [4682 9]
περίβλεπτος *see* Index XII
πίστις 4702 9
πιττάκιον 4704 6
πλοῖον 4685 back 1-12
πόλις 4677 4 4678 4 4681 5, 8, 12 4686 3, 4 4687
4 4688 5, 6 4689 6, 7, 10 4690 [3], 3 4692 [3], 5

- 4693** 5, 7, 11 [**4694** 5, 6, 10] **4695** 6, 8 **4696** 7 **4697** 4 **4698** 6 **4703** 6; *see also* Index X
- πολιτεία **4687** 8
 πολιτευόμενος *see* Index XII
 ποταμίτης *see* Index XIII
 ποτέ **4703** 4
 πραιπόσιτος *see* Index XII
 πρεσβύτερος *see* Index XI (a)
 προνοητής *see* Index XIII
 πρὸς [**4677** 8]
 προσαγορεύειν **4697** [9]–10
 προσιέναι **4697** 12
 πρότερος **4702** 8
 πρώην **4687** 8 **4695** 9
 πύλη **4704** 3
- ῥιπάριος *see* Index XII
- σημειούν **4680** 3 **4683** 4 **4699** 3
 σήμερον **4697** 16
 σίτος **4704** 3, 4, 6
 σός **4687** 5, 8 **4693** 11 [**4694** 9] **4702** 9
 σπορά [**4677** 9] **4682** 8 **4687** [7], 10
 στατιωνάριος *see* Index XII
 στρατιώτης *see* Index XII
 σύ **4677** 10 **4681** 11 **4689** 10 **4690** [4], 4 **4695** 9
 συμπλήρωσις **4690** 4
 σύν **4681** 14 **4689** 12 **4693** 13 [**4694** 11]
 ωστήρ *see* Index XI (a)
- τελεῖν **4681** 14 **4687** 11 **4693** 13 **4694** 11
 τέταρτος **4689** 11 **4693** 10
- τίμιος **4695** 6
 τόπος **4681** 13
 τρεῖς **4687** 11 **4697** 13
 τρίτος **4681** 10
- υἱός **4682** 4 **4686** 2, 4 **4689** 4, 6 **4690** 3 **4692** 4 **4693** 4 **4694** 3 **4695** 3, 7 **4696** 5, [7] **4697** [2], [5], 6 **4698** 7 **4700** 5 **4701** 7 **4702** 4 [**4703** 7]
 ὑμέτερος [**4697** 7]
 ὑμείς **4697** 9 **4701** 10
 ὑπάρχειν **4677** 10 **4681** 11 **4687** 7 **4689** 10 **4693** 10 **4694** 8–9
 ὑπατεία *see* Index XII
 ὑπέρ **4681** 14 **4687** 11 **4690** 5 **4693** 13 **4694** 11
 ὑπερώς **4681** 13
 ὑπό **4685** 6, 8, back 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 **4697** 9
 ὑπογράφειν **4703** 7
- φόρος **4687** 11
- χαίρειν [**4677** 7] **4680** 1 **4688** 6 **4690** 3 **4695** 8 **4702** 7
 χειρογραφία **4696** 9 **4697** 17
 χίλιοι **4693** 14
 χρεία [**4697** 8]
 χρεωστῆν [**4690** 4]
 χρηστήριον **4681** 14 **4689** 12 **4693** 13 [**4694** 11]
 χρυσός [**4690** 6] [**4694** 12, 13]
 χωρίον **4704** 3
 χωρίς **4695** 8

XVI. CORRECTIONS TO PUBLISHED TEXTS

VI 913 10	4687 9–10 n.
XVI 1958 4	4686 2 n.
XXXVI 2780 5	4701 2 n.
LXIII 4379 12–14	4687 10–11 n.
CPR V 24	4685 back 1 n.
P. Berol. 21753.2	4701 2 n.
P. Flor. III 325.8	4687 8–9 n.
P. Leid. Inst. 70.2	4701 2 n.
P. Lond. V 1793	4695 2–3 n.
P. Mil. II 64.1, 9	4688 2 n.
P. Wash. Univ. II 105.2	4700 3–5 n.
SB XVI 13015.13	4681 7 n.
SB XXII 15471	4696 5 n.